HISTORY OF SCOTLAND.

EDINBURGH:
PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE AND COMPANY,
PAUL'S WORK.

THE

HISTORY OF SCOTLAND

FROM THE

ACCESSION OF ALEXANDER III. TO THE UNION.

BY

PATRICK FRASER TYTLER,

F.R.S.E. & F.A.S.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

EDINBURGH:

WILLIAM P. NIMMO.

1864.

CONTENTS OF VOL. III.

CHAP. I.

MARY.

1542–1546.

	PAGE
State of Scotland at the death of James	1
Henry the Eighth's project for a marriage between the infant queen and the Prince of Wales	1
His intrigues with the Douglases and his Scottish prisoners	1
State of parties in Scotland	3
Cardinal Beaton's attempt to be regent	4
Earl of Arran chosen regent	4
Arrival of Cassillis, Glencairn, and the Scottish prisoners in Edinburgh	5
Their intrigues detected by Cardinal Beaton	5
Imprisonment of Beaton	5
Henry's foolish conduct	6
Efforts of the Catholic party	7
Meeting of parliament	8
The Bible communicated to the people	9
Arrival of Sadler, the English ambassador, in Edinburgh	9
The Cardinal recovers his liberty	10
Scottish ambassadors sent to England	11
The Earl of Lennox returns to Scotland	11
Arran recants his Protestant opinions	12
Beaton's able policy	12
Mission of Sir George Douglas to England	13
Treaties of peace and marriage	13
Opposed by Beaton	14
Arran's double conduct	15
Beaton gets possession of the young queen	15
Treaties of peace and marriage ratified	16
Unpopularity of Arran	16
Reconcilement between Arran and the cardinal	16
Henry resolves on war	17
Lennox joins the English party	17
Arrival of the French fleet	18
Unpopularity of the English party	18
Fine trait of the Scottish merchants	18
Seizure of Lords Maxwell and Somerville	19
Meeting of parliament	19
French ambassadors introduced	19
Strong feelings against England	19
Act against heretical opinions	20
Base conduct of the Douglases	20
Beaton's cruelty against the Reformers	21
Wishart's and Brunston's plot for the assassination or seizure of Beaton,	22
Great invasion of Scotland by the Earl of Hertford	22
Retreat of the English	23
Lennox and Glencairn, the only peers in the English interest	24
Glencairn totally defeated	24
Junction of the Catholic and Protestant parties	25
Deprivation of the Governor Arran	25
State of the Highlands and Isles	25
Disturbances in the Lowlands	26
Earl of Lennox's expedition against Scotland	26
Beaton labours in vain to reconcile the Scottish and English factions	27
Double conduct of the Douglases	27
Miserable condition of the country	28
Battle of Ancrum Moor, and defeat of the English	29
George Douglas continues his correspondence with Henry the Eighth	30
Mission of Cassillis to England	31
Proposals of Henry through Cassillis rejected	31
Cassillis's proposal for the assassination of Beaton	32
Mission of Forster into Scotland	32
Arrival of Lorges de Montgomerie in Scotland	34
Henry's negotiations with Donald, Lord of the Isles	35
Hertford invades Scotland	36
His dreadful ravages	36
Meeting of parliament at Stirling	37
Brunston's intrigues with England	38
Lord Maxwell imprisoned	39
Failure of Lennox's attempt on Dumbarton	39
Proposals of James Macconnell, Lord of the Isles, to Henry	40
Progress of the Reformation	40
Arrival of George Wishart in Scotland	41
His history, preaching, and friends	41
His journey to Edinburgh	42
He is seized by the Earl of Bothwell	43
His trial	43
His condemnation and execution	44
Its effects	44

PAGE
Beaton's progress into Angus . . 45
The conspiracy against him resumed . 45
Assassination of Beaton . . . 47
Observations 48

CHAP. II.

MARY.

1546-1554.

State of Scotland after the murder of Cardinal Beaton 48
John Knox and others join the conspirators 48
Knox's early history 48
Convention at Stirling 49
Huntly made Chancellor 50
Parliament assembled 50
Siege of the castle of St Andrews . . 50
Knox called to the ministry . . . 52
Death of Henry the Eighth and Francis the First 52
Policy of the Protector Somerset . . 52
Commencement of the war . . . 53
The French fleet arrives 53
Castle of St Andrews surrenders to Leo Strozzi 54
Knox and others carried to France . 54
Difficulties of the Governor . . . 55
Treachery of the nobles 55
Fiery Cross sent through the country . 56
Scottish army assembles at Musselburgh 57
Somerset invades Scotland . . . 57
Scottish cavalry defeated . . . 58
Attempt to arrest hostilities . . . 58
Battle of Pinkie 60
Angus defeats the English cavalry . 61
Panic of the Highlanders 62
The Scots defeated with great slaughter 62
Retreat of the Protector . . . 63
Invasion of Scotland by Wharton and Lennox 63
Spirited conduct of the queen-dowager 64
She proposes to send the young queen to France 64
Intrigues of the Scottish nobles in the service of England 64
They desert Lord Wharton and defeat him 65
His severe retaliation 66
Invasion of Scotland by Lord Grey . 66
Arrival of Monsieur D'Essé, with six thousand men, from France . . 67
Haddington invested 67
Meeting of parliament 67
Marriage of the young queen to the dauphin determined 67
She passes over to France 68
Ferocity of the war 69
Reinforcements from France . . 69
Peace concluded 70
Intrigues of the queen-dowager . . 70
She passes over to France . . . 71
Her projects to possess herself of the government of Scotland . . . 71
Opposition of the Governor Arran . 73
He resigns the regency to the queen-dowager 73
Meeting of parliament 73
Death of Edward the Sixth . . . 74

CHAP. III.

MARY.

1554-1559.

Character of Mary of Guise . . . 74
Her promotion of Frenchmen . . 74
Disturbances in the North . . . 75
Parliament assembled 76
Tax to support a standing army resisted 76
Mary of Guise joins the league between France and the Pope 77
The Scottish nobles refuse to invade England 77
Parliament assembled 78
Scottish commissioners sent to France 78
Marriage of Mary queen of Scots to the dauphin 78
Treachery of the Guises . . . 79
Sudden deaths of the Scottish commissioners 79
Parliament assembled 79
Accession of Elizabeth 80
Her general policy 80
Peace of Chateau Cambresis . . 80
Peace with Scotland 81
Retrospect of the progress of the Reformation in Scotland from 1547-1558 81
Knox's intercourse with Calvin . . 82
His return to Scotland (1555) . . 82
Its influence upon his party . . . 82
His chief supporters 83
He leaves Scotland for Geneva . . 83
Progress of the Reformation in his absence 84
First Covenant (3d Dec. 1557) . . 85
Alarm of the Romish clergy . . . 86
Cruel execution of Miln . . . 86
Remonstrance of the Protestants . 87
Their demands 87
Parliament of 1558 88
Duplicity of the queen-regent . . 88
Protest of the Reformers . . . 89
Policy of the queen-regent at the accession of Elizabeth (1558) . . . 89
Course of the history resumed . . 89
Plan of the Guises for the destruction of the Protestants in Europe . . 89
Mission of Bettancourt to Scotland . 90
Change in the policy of the queen-regent 90
Collision between the Protestant and Romish parties 90
Boldness of the Reformers . . . 90
The preachers summoned . . . 91
Arrival of Knox in Scotland, May 2, 1559 91
The Protestant lords accompany their preachers to Perth 91
Interview between Erskine of Dun and the queen-regent 91
Her dissimulation 91
Knox's sermon against idolatry . . 92
Demolition of the religious houses . 92
The queen-regent joined by Argyle and the Lord James 93

PAGE
Address of the Protestants to the queen and the nobility 93
To the Catholic clergy 94
Armistice between the two parties . 94
New bond, or second Covenant . . 95
The queen departs from the articles of the armistice 95
Argyle and the Lord James desert her . 95
Preaching of Knox 96
Franciscan and Dominican monasteries destroyed 96
Great numbers join the Congregation . 97
They make themselves masters of Perth 97
Knox's letter to Cecil 97
Destruction of the abbey church and palace of Scone 98
The Congregation take possession of Edinburgh 99

CHAP. IV.

MARY.

1559-1560.

Views of the Congregation . . . 99
Knox's letter to Percy 100
Kirkaldy meets Percy 100
Elizabeth favours the Congregation . 100
Proceedings of the queen-regent . . 101
Letter of the Congregation to Cecil . 101
His remarkable reply 102
The Congregation retire from Edinburgh 103
Mission of Sir James Melvil from France 103
Knox despatched to Berwick . . 104
The negotiation with England . . 104
Cautious policy of Elizabeth . . 105
Her real views 106
Letter of the Congregation to Cecil . 106
They resolve to depose the queen-regent 107
Character of Arran 107
Character of the Lord James . . 107
Knox's letter to Cecil 108
Sir Ralph Sadler sent to Berwick . 109
He meets Balnaves 109
Arrival of Arran in Scotland . . 110
Mission of Bettancourt from France . 110
First French auxiliaries arrive . . 110
Mission of the Bishop of Amiens . . 110
Arrival of Randolph in Scotland . . 111
Lethington joins the Congregation . 111
Debate on deposing the regent . . 112
She is deposed 112
Commencement of the war 113
The Congregation abandon Edinburgh 114
Efforts of Knox 114
Mission of Lethington to Elizabeth . 115
Policy and intrigues of Knox . . 115
Violent proceedings of the Duke . . 117
Arrival of the English fleet . . . 117
Treaty of Berwick 118
Lord Grey enters Scotland . . . 118
Progress of hostilities 119
Unsuccessful attempt at mediation . 119
The Congregation defeated at Leith . 120
Death and character of the queen-regent 121

CHAP. V.

MARY.

1560-1561.

PAGE
Anxiety of all parties for peace . . 122
Cecil and Wotton sent to Edinburgh . 122
Their negotiations with the French commissioners 122
Treaty of Edinburgh 123
Reflections 124
Peace proclaimed 8th July 1560 . . 125
Public thanksgiving by the Reformed party 126
Superintendents appointed 126
Parliament assembled 126
Its important deliberations . . . 126
Petition from the more zealous Reformers 127
Confession of Faith 129
It is sanctioned by parliament . . 130
Act abolishing the Papal power . . 130
Book of Discipline 131
Some of its provisions 131
It is violently opposed 131
Bill against the bishops 132
Council of Twelve 132
Proposal of a marriage between Arran and Elizabeth 133
Lethington sent to England . . . 133
Sir James Sandilands sent to France . 133
Interview of Throckmorton and the Cardinal Lorraine 133
Interview of Mary queen of Scots with Throckmorton 134
She refuses to confirm the treaty of Edinburgh 134
Her audience with Sandilands . . 135
Secret policy of France 135
The real designs of the Guises . . 136
Death of Francis the Second . . 136
Throckmorton's character of the young Queen of Scots 137
Her conduct after her husband's death 137
Parliament assembled at Edinburgh . 138
Proceedings of the Congregation . . 139
Proceedings of the Romanists . . 139
Intrigues of the Lord James . . 139
Arrival of commissioners from the Scottish queen 140
Their affectionate message and letters . 140
Lethington's description of the state of parties in Scotland 141
Mission of the Earl of Bedford to the Queen of Scots 141
His interview with that princess . . 142
Second audience 142
Mary's prudent replies 142
The Lord James's intrigues with Elizabeth and Cecil 143
His visit to the Queen of Scots at Rheims 144
Mary disregards the advice of the Romanists 145
She treats the Lord James with confidence 145
Her openness 145
Proposals of marriage to her . . 146
The Lord James offered a cardinal's hat 146
He betrays Mary's intentions to Throckmorton and Elizabeth . . . 146

	PAGE
Elizabeth secures his services	147
Mary's caution	147
She determines not to make him Governor of Scotland	147
Treachery of the Lord James	148
His secret intrigues with Cecil and Elizabeth	148
Schemes for intercepting Mary on her voyage	148
Elizabeth refuses her a passport	149
Cecil and Throckmorton's correspondence on this point,	150
Mary's remonstrance to Throckmorton	151
Her prudent and dignified conduct	151
She sets sail	152
Her arrival in her dominions, 19th August 1561	153

CHAP. VI.

MARY.

1561–1565.

	PAGE
Enthusiasm of Mary's first reception	153
Sudden change to discontent	153
Attack on the mass in her chapel	154
Proclamation as to religion	154
Mary's interview with Knox	154
His injudicious violence	154
Lethington's character of Mary	155
Mary's title to the English throne	156
Her anxiety to have it recognised by Elizabeth	156
Lethington's letter to Cecil	156
The Lord James's letter to the English queen on the same subject	156
Mary depresses the Romish party	157
Their discontent	158
Lethington's mission to Elizabeth	158
Sir Peter Mewtas sent to Mary	158
The Lord James restores order on the Borders,	159
General Assembly of the Church, and schisms amongst the Protestants	159
State of ecclesiastical property	159
Discontent of Knox and the ministers	160
Proposals of a meeting between Mary and Elizabeth	160
Opposed by Knox	161
Madness of the Earl of Arran	161
His accusation of himself and Bothwell	161
Randolph's testimony to Mary's justice and clemency	162
Her prudent administration	162
Marriage of the Lord James, who is made Earl of Mar	163
He is sent again to reduce the Borders to obedience	163
Proposals of marriage by the King of Sweden	163
Elizabeth agrees to an interview	164
Mary's satisfaction	164
Hostile policy of France	164
Mission of Sir Henry Sidney into Scotland	165
Elizabeth delays the interview	165
Arrival of a messenger from the Pope	165
Mary's progress to the North	165
Her suspicions of Huntly	166
She summons Inverness castle	166
Huntly rises in arms	166
His defeat and death	167
Reflections on his fall	167
War between France and England	167
Mary's anxiety	168
Violence of Knox	168
Randolph censures him	168
Knox's interview with Mary	168
His criticism on the court dancing	169
Story of Chartellet	170
Mission of Lethington to England	170
Miserable state of France	171
Mary anxious to have Elizabeth's advice as to her marriage	171
Mystery of Cecil	172
Violence of Knox	172
Policy of his party	172
His interview with the queen	173
Archbishop of St Andrews, and others, arraigned for saying mass, and imprisoned	173
Quarrel between Knox and the Lord James	173
Knox's pulpit address to the Protestant nobles	174
He attacks the queen's marriage	174
His violent interview with Mary	175
He apostrophises the court ladies	175
Lethington blames Knox's violence	175
Knox's letter to Cecil	175
Elizabeth proposes Leicester as a match for Mary	176
Mary's reply to Randolph	177
Reflections	177
Lethington's remonstrances to Cecil	178
Elizabeth's perplexity	178
Her pretexts for delay	178
Proposed restoration of Lennox	179
Elizabeth's duplicity on this subject	179
Spirited replies of Moray and Lethington	179
Return of Lennox to Scotland	180
Mary's favour to him	180
Elizabeth's Latin letter to Cecil	181
Sir James Melvil's mission to England	181
His account of the English queen	182
Elizabeth again proposes Leicester	183
Randolph's testimony to Mary's sincerity	184
Elizabeth's dissimulation	184
Protracted negotiations	185
Cecil's mysterious diplomacy	185
Restoration of the Earl of Lennox	185
Randolph's graphic picture of Mary	186
Her conversation with him	186
Her sentiments on her marriage	187
Her opinion of Leicester	188
Darnley arrives in Scotland	188
His favourable reception	188
Moray and Lethington urge the marriage with Leicester	189
Elizabeth refuses to recognise Mary's title	190
Mary's feelings	190
She is disappointed, and indignant	190
Difficulties of her situation	191
She resolves to marry Darnley	191
Her solicitude and affection for him	192

	PAGE
He is spoilt by his prosperity	192
Lethington sent to England	193
Feud between Bothwell and Moray	193
State of factions in Scotland	193
Randolph's letters	193
Caution against Randolph's misrepresentations	196
Mary's attempt to gain Moray	196
Her instructions to Lethington	197
Lethington's treacherous conduct	197
Convention at Stirling	198
The nobles agree to Mary's marriage	198
Arrival of Throckmorton at Stirling	198
Mary's dignified reply to him	198
English privy-council protest against the marriage	199
Strength of the Papists in England	200
State of English parties	200
Randolph's crafty and false representations	200
Mission of Hay to Elizabeth	201
Schemes of the Protestants for assassinating Darnley	201
They solicit Elizabeth's assistance	201
She recalls Lennox and Darnley	202
Moray and his party pretend that religion is in danger	202
Falsehood of this assertion proved by his own letters	202
Observations on the conduct of Knox	202
Tumultuous meeting of the Protestants at Edinburgh	203
Heads of their supplication	203
Mary's temperate reply	203
Conspiracy of Moray and Argyle	204
They intend to seize or murder Darnley	204
Mary defeats the plot	204
Her vigorous measures against the rebels	205
Moray's schemes detected	205
Elizabeth intercedes for him	206
Mary's reply	206
Her marriage with Darnley	207

CHAP. VII.

MARY.

1565-1567.

	PAGE
Mary's activity after her marriage	207
Mission of Tamworth	208
Mary's remonstrances to Elizabeth	208
Moray and the insurgent barons advance to Edinburgh, and are coldly received	209
Bothwell's return to Scotland	210
Fears of the Protestant party	210
Influence of Riccio	211
Moray driven from Scotland	212
Elizabeth's public severity to him	212
He is secretly encouraged	212
Arrival of envoys from France	213
The Roman Catholic League	213
Mary joins it	214
Origin of the conspiracy against Riccio	214
The plot known to Randolph	215
Second stage of the conspiracy	216
Co-operation of the Protestants	216
Two "bands" for the commission of the crime	217
The plot communicated to Burghley and Elizabeth	218
The queen and Riccio disregard warnings of the approaching danger	219
The murder of Riccio	220
Mary's danger and terror	220
Moray's return	221
The queen escapes to Dunbar	222
Mary's advance to Edinburgh, and flight of Morton to England	223
Mary discovers Darnley's guilt	223
Joseph Riccio promoted	224
Birth of James the Sixth	224
Mary reconciles her nobility	225
Interview between the king and the queen	226
The king's unreasonable conduct	227
Rage of the nobles against the king	227
Power of Bothwell	227
Disorders on the Borders	228
Mary's visit to Bothwell at the Hermitage	228
Her dangerous illness and great unhappiness	229
Secret conference at Craigmillar	230
Conspiracy against the king	231
"Band" for his murder	231
Baptism of the prince	231
The king's absence from it	232
His illness	232
Lennox and Darnley's designs against the queen	233
Joseph Riccio and Joseph Lutyni	233
Return of Morton	235
Bothwell, Lethington, and Morton resolve to murder the king	235
Mary meets the king	235
She brings him to the Kirk of Field	236
Details of the plot	237
Murder of Darnley	238
Mary's delay in investigating the murder	238
Bothwell continues in favour	239
Shares with Lethington, Argyle, and Huntly the confidence of the queen	240
Letter from the Bishop of Glasgow	241
Elizabeth sends Killigrew to Scotland	241
Trial of Bothwell resolved on	242
Elizabeth's message to delay it	243
Bothwell's trial and acquittal	244
Band of the nobles for his marriage with the queen	245
Grange's letters against the queen	246
Anonymous letter to Cecil	246
Bothwell carries the queen to Dunbar	247
Grange's letter to Bedford	247
Bothwell's divorce	248
Robert Melvil's letter to Cecil	248
Confederacy against Bothwell	248
Communications with Elizabeth	249
Craig publishes the banns of marriage between Mary and Bothwell, accompanied by a protest	250
Mary's marriage to Bothwell	251

CHAP. VIII.

MARY.

1567.

	PAGE
General indignation at Mary's marriage	251

	PAGE
Coalition of the nobles against Bothwell	252
Mary sends the Bishop of Dunblane to France	253
Robert Melvil sent to Elizabeth	253
Bothwell's letter to the English queen	253
Bothwell and Mary retire to Borthwick castle	254
Attempt to surprise them there	254
Their escape to Dunbar	254
Advance to Carberry Hill	255
Mary surrenders to the confederates	256
Bothwell suffered to escape	256
Mary carried captive to Edinburgh	257
Imprisonment in Lochleven castle	257
Alleged intercepted letters	258
Apprehension of Cullen and Blacater	259
Execution of Blacater	259
Convention of the queen's lords at Dumbarton	260
Knox's return to Edinburgh	260
His vigorous exertions	261
Mission and transactions of Robert Melvil	262
Melvil repairs to Lochleven	263
Mission of Sir N. Throckmorton from Elizabeth	264
Elizabeth's secret acknowledgment of her unjust conduct to Mary	264
Mary's danger and Throckmorton's interference	265
Moray's conduct	265
Violent enmity of the Presbyterian clergy against Mary	266
Robert Melvil sent again to Lochleven	267
His refusal to convey a letter from Mary to Bothwell	267
Meeting of the General Assembly	268
Mary compelled to resign the crown, and appoint Moray regent	268
Coronation of the prince her son	269
Elizabeth's severity to the confederates	270
Treacherous conduct of the faction of the Hamiltons	270
Conference between Throckmorton and Hamilton	271
Expected return of Moray from France	272
Situation and expected measures of Moray	272
His interview with Elizabeth	273
His arrival in Scotland	274
Remarkable interview with Mary at Lochleven	274
He is proclaimed regent	276

CHAP. IX.

REGENCY OF THE EARL OF MORAY. 1567-1569.

	PAGE
Interview of Moray and Lethington with Throckmorton	276
Throckmorton leaves Scotland	278
Moray's vigorous administration	278
His transactions with Sir James Balfour	278
His difficulties as to the king's murder	278
Apprehension of some of the assassins	278
Submission of Huntly and Herries	279
Bothwell escapes to Norway	279
Parliament assembles — Lethington's speech	279
Its proceedings	280
Moray's unfair dealing as to evidence of the king's murder	282
Trial and execution of the murderers	283
Discontent of the people	283
Moray's difficulties	284
Mary's escape from Lochleven	285
Moray's vigour and decision	286
Mary sends Beaton her servant to France	286
Mary's humane policy thwarted by the Hamiltons	287
Defeat of the queen at Langside	288
Her flight into England	288
Her letters to Elizabeth	289
Moray accuses the queen of the king's murder, and offers to prove her guilt	290
Elizabeth's difficult situation	290
Her message to Mary and to Moray	291
Mary's spirited answer	291
Cautious preliminary inquiries of Moray	292
Elizabeth's crafty answers	292
Conspiracy against Moray	293
Their disputes referred by Mary and the regent to Elizabeth	293
Moray and Elizabeth name their commissioners	294
Mary names hers	295
Opening of the proceedings at York	295
Mary's complaint and Moray's reply	296
Intrigues of Norfolk	296
Mary follows Norfolk's advice	297
Removal of the conferences to Westminster	298
Moray's secret offers to Mary	298
Mary consents to them	298
Moray comes to London	298
His embarrassments	299
Conferences at Westminster	299
Moray accuses Mary of the king's murder	300
Reply of Mary's commissioners	300
Artful conduct of Elizabeth	301
Her refusal to hear Mary in person	301
Mary's commissioners break off the conferences	302
Moray produces his proofs	302
Elizabeth's proceedings in consequence	302
Mary offers to prove the forgery of the letters	303
Elizabeth pronounces her decision	304
Moray's answer to Mary's accusations	305
He returns to Scotland	305
Cecil offers Mary copies of the letters	305
General reflections	305
Moray's intrigues with Cecil	307
His difficulties	307
Plot to assassinate him	307
He overreaches Norfolk	307
His activity on his return to Scotland	308
A convention of the nobility agreed upon	308
Moray imprisons the duke and Herries	309
He leads an army into the north	309
Submission of Huntly and Argyle	309
Projected marriage of Mary and Norfolk	309
Norfolk's exertions and ambition	310
Letters from Elizabeth to Moray	311
Throckmorton's letters on the marriage	311

PAGE
Moray's duplicity 312
Rejection of all proposals in Mary's favour 312
Norfolk's secret intrigues discovered . 312
Moray betrays him 313
Norfolk sent to the Tower 313
Lethington accused of the king's murder 313
Lethington and the Balfours brought prisoners to Edinburgh 314
Lethington rescued by Kirkaldy of Grange 314
Rebellion of Northumberland . . . 314
Rebel earls fly to Scotland 315
Lethington's trial delayed 316
Moray seizes the Earl of Northumberland 317
Proposes that Mary should be sent back to Scotland 317
Knox's letter on this subject . . . 318
Mission of Elphinston to Elizabeth . 318
The Bishop of Ross counteracts his schemes 319
Assassination of the Regent Moray by Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh . . . 320
Reflections 320

CHAP. X.

INTERREGNUM—REGENCIES OF LENNOX AND MAR.

1570-1572.

State of Scotland on the death of Moray 322
Difficulties of Elizabeth 322
Cecil's policy and advice 323
Lennox's "supplication" to Elizabeth . 323
Conference between Drury and Morton's party 323
Randolph sent into Scotland . . . 324
Lethington pronounced guiltless of the king's murder 324
Rebellion of Leonard Dacres . . . 325
Miserable state of Scotland . . . 325
Relative strength of the two factions . 325
Sir James Melvil's picture of the country 326
Randolph's intrigues 326
Verac arrives from France 327
Elizabeth's cruel policy 327
The Earl of Sussex invades Scotland . 328
Lennox co-operates with him . . . 328
Correspondence between Sussex and Lethington 329
Lennox made interim Lieutenant-governor of Scotland 331
Elizabeth's approval 332
Lennox formally chosen regent . . 332
Civil war 332
Sussex again invades Scotland . . 333
Elizabeth and Cecil's duplicity . . 334
Exasperation of the two factions . . 334
Randolph's defence of Moray's memory 334
Knox's refusal to pray for the queen 335
Capture of Dumbarton castle . . 336
Execution of the Primate . . . 337
Cecil's severe letter to Grange . . 338
Morton's return from England . . 338
Continuation of the civil war . . 339
Wretched state of the country . . 339
Rival parliaments 339
Lennox surprised in Stirling . . 340
Subsequent failure of the enterprise . 341
Assassination of Lennox . . . 341
His death 342
The Earl of Mar chosen regent . . 342
Successes of Adam Gordon in the north 342
Intrigues of Norfolk in England . . 342
His execution 343
Correspondence between Drury and Grange 343
Lethington's letter to Cecil . . . 343
Elizabeth's policy 343
Ferocious character of the war . . 343
Successes of Mary's friends . . . 344
They consent to a truce 345
Massacre of St Bartholomew . . . 345
Its effects on Elizabeth's policy . . 345
She is openly recommended to put Mary to death 346
Her peremptory refusal 346
Secret plot of Elizabeth to have Mary put to death in Scotland . . . 346
Mission of Henry Killigrew to Scotland 346
His secret instructions 347
His meeting with Morton 347
Negotiations of Nicholas Elphinston . 348
Burghley's letter 348
Killigrew consults Knox 349
His description of the Reformer . . 349
Knox co-operates with Killigrew . . 349
Killigrew's secret letter to Burghley and Leicester 349
Mary not to be permitted to live four hours after she comes to Scotland . 351
Continuation of Killigrew's negotiation . 351
Mar consents 351
Death of the Regent Mar 352
Dismay and agitation of Burghley . . 352
Burghley's letter to Leicester . . 352
Northumberland's execution . . . 353

CHAP. XI.

REGENCY OF MORTON.

1572-1573.

Elizabeth's measures on the death of Mar 354
Morton chosen regent 354
Killigrew's advices to Burghley . . 354
Illness and death of Knox . . . 355
Renewal of the war 357
Measures of reconciliation between the regent and the nobility . . . 357
Episcopacy established in Scotland . 358
Submission of the duke and Huntly . 358
Condition of Mary's party . . . 358
Letter of Killigrew to Burghley . . 359
Siege of the castle of Edinburgh . . 360
Grange offers to surrender . . . 361
His terms refused 361
Grange and Lethington surrender to the Queen of England . . . 361
Last letter of Grange and Lethington to Burghley 362
Death of Lethington 362
Efforts made to save Grange's life . 363
Execution of Grange 363
Mary's cause desperate 363

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS . . . 365

agement of political affairs were superior to those of his brother the earl, over whose mind he possessed great influence; and if we may believe the expressions which he employed in his correspondence with Henry, he appears to have forgotten his allegiance to his natural prince in the humility of his homage, and the warmth of his devotion to the English monarch.[1]

The project of a marriage between young Edward and the Scottish queen was in itself so plausible, and, if concluded upon an equitable basis and with a just attention to the mutual rights and independence of each country, appeared so likely to be attended with the happiest results, that it required little argument to recommend it to the Scottish prisoners, even had they not seen in it the only road by which they were to escape from their captivity; but whilst all can understand their readiness to promote a matrimonial alliance, and a perpetual union between the two kingdoms, had Henry confined his views to such a general design, the conduct pursued by that monarch, and the conditions which he offered, were such as no man of independent and patriotic feelings could, without ignominy, have embraced. He insisted that they should acknowledge him as lord superior of the kingdom of Scotland; that the prisoners should exert their influence to procure for him the government of the kingdom, and the immediate resignation of all its fortresses into his hands; that they should use their utmost efforts to have the infant queen delivered into his power, to be kept in England;[2] and, in the event of such demands being refused by the parliament of Scotland, he stipulated that their whole feudal strength was to be employed in co-operating with his army, and completing the conquest of the country. Nor did the English monarch content himself with the bare promise of his prisoners to fulfil his wishes: the affair was transacted with much rigour and solemnity. A bond or obligation was drawn up, which engrossed these stipulations. To this they were required to subscribe their names, and confirm it by their oath; they were to leave their eldest sons, or nearest relatives, in their place as pledges for their fidelity; should they fail in accomplishing the wishes of the king, they were to return to their prisons in England, on his so requiring it; or, if he judged it more profitable for the accomplishment of his design, they were to remain in Scotland and assist him in the war.[3] The bond, in short, contained terms which virtually annihilated the existence of Scotland as a separate kingdom; and sad as is the fate of the captive, I am not prepared to admit that the Scottish prisoners were placed in a situation which called for hesitation. They were called upon to choose whether they were to preserve unsullied their individual honour, and maintain their national independence, by remaining in prison, and braving a captivity which the cruelty of Henry might render perpetual; or whether they were to return dishonoured to their country, bound by the most solemn obligation to employ their strength in reducing it to the condition of a province of England. Under such circumstances the citizen of a free country ought to have felt that he had only one resolution to adopt; and it is with sorrow it must be declared, this resolution was not the one embraced by the Scottish nobles. Unable to endure the thoughts of remaining in England, the Earls of Glencairn and Cassillis, with the Lords Maxwell, Somerville, and Oliphant, agreed to the conditions upon which Henry permitted them to revisit their country; subscribed the bond, by which, to use the words of the governor Arran, they were tied in fetters to England; confirmed it with their oath; and, having left hostages in the hands of that

[1] Original letter of Sir G. Douglas, in State-paper Office, dated January 10, 1542-3, to Lord Lisle, the English warden:—"Yff it pleases God that I continewe withe lyff and helthe, I shall do my soverand lord and maister gud servyce be the helpe of God; and yff I dey, I shall depart his trewe servand."

[2] Sadler's State Papers, vol. i. pp. 69, 74, 75, 81.

[3] Sadler's State Papers, vol. i. p. 97.

monarch, prepared to set out on their return.[1] On their arrival, they cautiously abstained from revealing the full extent of their obligation, and spoke in general terms upon the advantages to be derived from the marriage with England. At the same time it is not to be forgotten, in justice to the Scottish aristocracy, that whilst its leading members did not scruple to sign this unworthy agreement, the majority of the prisoners taken at the Solway remained in captivity in England. It cannot, however, be affirmed with certainty that to them Henry had presented the same temptation which overcame the virtue of their more wealthy and influential brethren. I have been thus minute in describing the transaction which took place between the English monarch and his prisoners, because it was afterwards attended with important consequences, and has not been noticed by any former historian with either the care or the full reprobation which it deserves.

Whilst such was the policy adopted by Henry, the sudden death of James the Fifth gave rise to a very opposite course of events in Scotland; it left that country once more exposed to all the evils of a minority, and divided by two great parties. Of these, the first, and that which had hitherto been the strongest, was the body of the Catholic clergy, at the head of which stood the cardinal Beaton, a man possessed certainly of high talents, and far superior in habits of business, acquaintance with human character, and the energetic pursuit of his purposes, to his opponents; but profligate in his private conduct, insatiable in his love of power, and attached to the Roman Catholic faith with a devotedness which, without any breach of charity, we may pronounce as much the offspring of ambition, as the result of conviction. Of this faction the guiding principles were a determined opposition to the progress of the Reformation, and a devotion to the papal see,—friendship with France, hostility to England; and a resolution, which all must applaud, of preserving the ancient independence of their country. To them the late king, more from political motives than anything like personal bigotry, had lent the important strength of the royal favour and countenance.

In the ranks of the opposite faction were found a considerable portion of the nobility, of whom many of the leading chiefs favoured the doctrines of the Reformation, whilst all had viewed with alarm the late severe measures of the king. They were led by the Earl of Arran: a man of an amiable disposition, but indolent in his habits, and unhappily of that undecided temper which unfitted him to act with energy and success in times of so much confusion and difficulty. His bias to the reformed opinions was well known, and his royal rank, as nearest in succession to the crown, compelled him to assume an authority from which his natural character was inclined to shrink. It was to this party, whose weight was now to be increased by the accession of Angus and the Douglases, that Henry looked for his principal supporters; and considering the promises which he had received from the prisoners taken at the Solway Moss, he entertained little doubt of carrying his project in the Scottish parliament.

With regard to the great body of the people, of which we must remember that the middle and commercial classes alone possessed any influence in the government, they appear to have been animated at this time by somewhat discordant feelings. Many favoured the principles of the Reformation, and, so far as these were concerned, gave a negative support to Henry by their hostility to the cardinal and his party; but their sense of national independence, and their jealousy of England as the ancient enemy of their country, was a deep-seated feeling, which was ready to erect itself into active opposition on the slightest assumption of superiority by the rival kingdom. The conviction of this ought to have put Henry on his guard; but it was the frequent misfortune of this monarch, to lose his

[1] Maitland, vol. ii. p. 838.

highest advantages by the arrogance and violence with which he pursued them.

Immediately after the death of the king, the cardinal produced a paper which he declared to be the will of the late monarch. It is asserted by most of our historians, and the story was confirmed by the positive testimony of the Earl of Arran,[1] that this was a forged instrument procured by guiding the king's hand upon the paper when he was in his last extremity, and utterly insensible to its contents. It is certain that it appointed Beaton guardian to the infant queen, and chief governor of the realm, with the assistance of a council composed of the Earls of Argyle, Huntly, and Moray, all of whom were devoted to his service; and without giving his opponents time or opportunity to examine its provisions, or ascertain its authenticity, the cardinal had himself proclaimed regent, and hastened to assume the active management of the state. But his power, though great, was not sufficient to support him for above a few days in so bold a usurpation: the nobility assembled, and Arran, rousing himself from his constitutional indolence, claimed the office of regent, insisting that by law it belonged to him as next heir to the crown;[2] the pretended will he described as a forged document, to which no faith was to be attached, and, notwithstanding the utmost efforts of the cardinal, his claim was universally admitted. He was chosen governor, and solemnly installed in his office on the 22d of December 1542. Arrangements were then made for the maintenance of the household of the young queen, and her mother the queen-dowager, whilst it was determined that the Earl of Angus and the Douglases, who had been doomed to so long a banishment in England, should be restored to their possessions, and admitted to that share in the government which belonged to their high rank. A remarkable circumstance increased the power and popularity of Arran, and the dread with which the country regarded the cardinal. Upon the king's person at the time of his death was found a secret scroll, containing the names of above three hundred and sixty of the nobility and gentry who were suspected of entertaining heretical opinions, and whose estates on this ground were recommended to be confiscated for the support of the king.[3] This private list, it was affirmed, had been furnished by Beaton, immediately after the refusal of the army to invade England, and although James rejected, on a former occasion, all such proposals, as a base project of the clergy to sow dissensions between himself and his nobles, it was suspected that his resolution had, after the rout of the Solway, given way to the entreaties of the cardinal. At the head of these names stood Arran; and it may easily be believed, that with those of the common people who favoured the Reformation, and the nobles who were enemies to the Church of Rome, such a discovery produced a community of interests and an inveteracy of feeling which added no little strength to the party of the governor.

Although defeated in his first attempt to seize on the supreme power, Beaton was not discouraged. He despatched messengers to France, representing to the house of Guise the crisis to which affairs had arrived in Scotland, the extreme danger attending a union between the Prince of Wales and their infant queen, the peril which threatened the Church, and the necessity of an immediate supply of money, arms, and soldiers, to enable him to maintain the struggle against his opponents:[4] he worked upon the fears of those whom he knew to be sincere lovers of

[1] Sadler's State Papers, vol. i. p. 138.

[2] Knox, History, p. 35. Letter, State-paper Office, January 10, 1542-3: Sir George Douglas to Lord Lisle, informing him he had received a safe-conduct from the Earl of Arran, calling himself governor, and proposed setting out that night for Edinburgh. Also Letter, State-paper Office, from the Earls of Cassillis and Glencairn, with the Lords Fleming and Maxwell, to Henry the Eighth, dated 19th of January, 1542-3, Carlisle. On the 20th of January they are to set out for Scotland.

[3] Sadler's State Papers, vol. i. p. 94.

[4] Ibid., vol. i. p. 138.

their country, by assuring them that the marriage which was now talked of so lightly, was nothing less than a project for the entire destruction of Scotland as an independent kingdom; and he procured the support of the middle and commercial classes by reminding them of the unprovoked seizure of their merchantmen by Henry, during a time of peace; declaiming against the injustice which prompted that prince still to detain their vessels and enrich himself with their cargoes. All these means were not without effect; and it began to be suspected that, notwithstanding his first repulse, the simplicity and indolence of Arran would not long be able to hold its ground against the energy of so talented and daring an enemy as the cardinal.

Such appears to have been the state of parties when the Scottish prisoners, the Earls of Cassillis and Glencairn, with the Lords Fleming, Maxwell, Somerville, and Oliphant, took their departure from London. They were preceded in their journey by Angus and Sir George Douglas, who left the English court ten days before them, and posted down to Edinburgh for the purpose of conducting the first and most delicate part of the negotiation regarding the marriage. On their arrival a council was held by the governor, in which the projected matrimonial alliance between the kingdoms was discussed in a general manner, and received with that favourable consideration with which at first sight all were disposed to regard it. It is here necessary to keep in mind that Sir George Douglas, who was the main agent of the English monarch in this negotiation, had three great objects in view, all of which he seems to have pursued with a prudence and diplomatic craft which prove him to have been no mean adept in the management of state intrigue. The reversal of his own and his brother's treason, and their restoration to their estates, was to be his first step; the procuring the consent of the Scottish parliament to the marriage, the second; and the last and most important of all, the obtaining the delivery to Henry of the person of the infant queen, the surrender of the fortresses of the kingdom, and the consent of the three estates to have the country placed under the government of England. It is certain, from the authentic correspondence which yet remains, that Douglas and some of the Scottish prisoners had promised the English king their utmost endeavours to attain all these objects, the last of which amounted to an act of treason; but they were compelled to proceed with great wariness. They knew well that the first mention of such ignominious conditions would rouse the country and the parliament to a determined opposition,[1] and that all who would have welcomed upon fair terms the prospect of a matrimonial union between the kingdoms, would yet have scorned to purchase it at the price of their independence. It became necessary, therefore, to feel their way and commence with caution, so that, at the council which was held immediately after their return to Edinburgh, no whisper of such ultimate designs was suffered to escape them.

All their efforts, however, could not prevent the cardinal from becoming acquainted with their intrigues, and the use which he made of this knowledge in strengthening his party convinced them that, if so active an enemy were left at large, they could hardly hope for success; a secret resolution was therefore formed, and executed with that daring promptitude which so often leads to success. Beaton, whose correspondence with France was construed into treason, was suddenly arrested, (20th January 1542-3,) and, before he had time to summon his friends, or protest against such injustice, hurried to the castle of Blackness, and committed to the custody of

[1] See the Letter in the State-paper Office. Lord Lisle to the Duke of Suffolk, dated Berwick, 2d of February 1542-3:—"I asked him whether he had begun to practice with his frindes, touchyng the king's majesty's purpose. He said it was not tyme yet, for altho he and his broder had manye frindes, he durst not move the matter as yet to none of them; for if he shuld, he is sure they wolde starte from them, everie man."

Lord Seton.[1] Having thus boldly begun, proclamation was made that every man, under pain of treason, should resist the landing of any army from France,—a suspicion having arisen, that a fleet which had been seen off Holy Island was a squadron led by the Duke of Guise, for the invasion of Scotland. It soon appeared, however, to be some Scottish ships of war, with nineteen English prizes, which they afterwards brought safely into harbour. A parliament was appointed to be held on the 12th of March for the discussion of the proposed alliance with England, and the condemnation of the cardinal; whilst it was proposed that Henry should immediately grant an abstinence of war, and a safe-conduct to the Scottish ambassadors, who were to conclude a perpetual peace between the two realms.

The seizure of the cardinal, however, was attended with effects which his opponents had not anticipated. The public services of religion were suspended; the priests refused to administer the sacraments of baptism and burial; the churches were closed: a universal gloom overspread the countenances of the people; and the country presented the melancholy appearance of a land excommunicated for some awful crime. The days, indeed, were past, when the full terrors of such a state of spiritual proscription could be felt, yet the Catholic party were still strong in Scotland; they loudly exclaimed against their opponents for so daring an act of sacrilege and injustice; and the people began, in some degree, to identify the cause of Beaton with the independence of the country, exclaiming against the Douglases and the Scottish prisoners as the pensioners of England.[2] It was suspected, that more was concealed under the proposed marriage and alliance with England than the friends of Henry dared as yet avow; cabals were formed amongst the nobles; and the Earls of Huntly, Bothwell, and Moray, offering themselves as surety for the appearance of the cardinal to answer the charges against him, imperiously demanded that he should be set at liberty. The refusal of this request by the governor and the Douglases convinced their opponents that their suspicions were not without foundation; Argyle, one of the ablest and most powerful amongst the barons, retired to his own country, with the object of mustering his strength, and providing for the storm which he saw approaching; whilst the mutual jealousies and animosities amongst those left behind gathered strength so rapidly, that it seemed probable they must lead to some alarming civil commotion.[3]

This fatal result was likely to be hastened by the conduct of the English king. Incensed to the utmost degree against the cardinal, whom the Pope had recently appointed legate *a latere* in Scotland, he insisted on his being delivered into his hands to be imprisoned in England.[4] He pressed the Earl of Angus and his Scottish

[1] Keith, p. 27. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 26. Sadler's State Papers, vol. i. pp. 137, 138. MS. letter in State-paper Office, Sir Thomas Wharton to the Duke of Suffolk, February 2, 1542-3: "My said servant sheweth the ordre of the takyng of the cardinal, much after the form as I have wryttyn. He saith he hard the proclamation made after the same at the cross in Edinburgh, by the governor and the noblemen with him, that his takyng was for certain treasons agaynst the realm, and not for any takyng away the funds of the churche."

[2] Letter, State-paper Office, Sir Thomas Wharton to the Duke of Suffolk, Carlisle, February 2, 1542-3. See also an important letter, Lord Lisle to the Duke of Suffolk, dated February 1, 1542-3, at Berwick:—"And consideryng this busynes that is uppon the takyng of the cardinall, whiche, at this present, is at such a staye, that they can cause no priest within Scotland to saye masse syns the cardinall was taken, neyder to crysten or burye."

[3] Letter, ut supra. Sir Thomas Wharton to the Duke of Suffolk. State-paper Office.

[4] Letter, State-paper Office, Lord Lisle to Duke of Suffolk, February 2, 1542-3. "I asked hym whether his broder and he wold deliver the cardynal to the king's majesty —— if his highness to have hym. Whereat he (Sir George Douglas) studied a lyttel, and said that if they shulde doo so, they (should be) mistraisted as of England's partie, but that he suld be as surely kept as if he were in England, for neyther governor nor any oder in Scotland shall have hym out of their handes." The letter having suffered much by damp is difficult to decipher.

prisoners to fulfil their promises regarding the surrender of the fortresses, and was highly dissatisfied when he found his orders not likely to be obeyed. In an interview between Sir George Douglas, and Lord Lisle the English warden, which took place at Berwick,[1] the Scottish baron endeavoured to convince him of the imprudence of thus attempting to precipitate so delicate an affair. He assured him that if the king were content to proceed with caution, he had little doubt of accomplishing his utmost wishes, but that at present the delivery of the cardinal, or the slightest attempt to seize the fortresses, would lead to certain failure. In the meantime he promised that Beaton, against whose talent and intrigue they could never be too much on their guard, should be as safely kept with them as he could be in England; and as the report still continued that the Duke of Guise was about to visit Scotland,[2] he agreed, at the suggestion of Lord Lisle, to alter their first resolution, which had been to grant this prince an interview, and to adopt the safer plan of interdicting him or his attendants from landing in any of the harbours of the kingdom. Convinced, or, at least, assuming the appearance of being satisfied by such representations, Henry consented to the prolongation of the abstinence of war till the month of June,[3] and awaited, with as much patience as he could command, the meeting of the Scottish parliament. In the meantime he sent orders to Sir Ralph Sadler to repair instantly as his ambassador to Edinburgh, and he determined to keep a jealous watch on the proceedings of France, as it was now confidently asserted that the Duke of Guise and the Earl of Lennox had fitted out an expedition against Scotland in some of the ports of Normandy.[4]

Shortly before the meeting of parliament, an attempt was made by the Catholic party to counteract the intrigues of the English faction, which had now gained a complete command over the governor. The Earls of Huntly, Moray, Bothwell, and Argyle, supported by a powerful body of the barons and landed gentry, and a numerous concourse of bishops and abbots, assembled at Perth, avowing their determination to resist the measures of the governor and the Douglases. They despatched Reid, the bishop of Orkney, a prelate of primitive simplicity and integrity, with certain proposals to their opponents. Of these, the first insisted that the cardinal should be set at liberty, and that the New Testament should not be read in the vulgar tongue by the people; they demanded, at the same time, that the Scottish ambassadors who had been named by Henry should not be intrusted with the negotiation of the marriage, but others chosen in their stead, and they asserted their right to be consulted by the governor in all affairs of importance. It was not to be expected that Arran or his haughty councillors should for a moment listen to such a message. It was received with a scornful and positive refusal; and scarce had its authors time to recover from their disappointment, when they saw a herald-at-arms enter their assembly, who, in the name of the governor, and under the pain of treason, charged them to disperse their convocation, and return to their duty and allegiance. Nor did they dare to disobey the summons. The penalties of treason to which they knew their rivals in power would not be loath to subject them, were of too serious a kind to be despised, and, after a brief

[1] Letter, State-paper Office, Lord Lisle to the Duke of Suffolk, quoted above, February 2, 1542-3.

[2] Letter, State-paper Office, the Duke of Suffolk and council of the north to the privy-council, advising them of the appearance of a large fleet off Holy Island, supposed to be the Duke de Guise's squadron, dated at Newcastle, 3d February 1542-3.

[3] Original agreement of abstinence of war, signed by James earl of Arran, as governor of Scotland, (State-paper Office,) dated February 20, 1542-3, in the name of Mary queen of Scotland; also, copy Agreement for Cessation of Hostilities on the part of Henry the Eighth.

[4] Privy-council of England to the Duke of Suffolk, March 13, 1542-3. State-paper Office. Earl of Arran to the Duke of Suffolk, March 8, 1542-3. State-paper Office.

deliberation, they determined to adopt the safest course. On the day previous to the meeting of the three Estates, the Earl of Huntly sent in his adherence to the governor, and, under an assurance of safety, repaired to the capital to give his presence in the parliament; his example was followed by all the clergy assembled at Perth, as well as by the Earls of Moray and Bothwell; whilst Argyle, prevented by sickness from repairing to the parliament in person, sent his procuratory and his two uncles to plead his apology. They had evidently miscalculated their strength, and observing the number and the vigour of their opponents, deemed it prudent not to push matters to extremity, trusting by their influence in the great council of the nation, to neutralise the obsequious spirit of the English faction, and if they consented to the marriage, to fetter it at least with such conditions as should insure the independence of their country; nor were they disappointed in their endeavours.[1]

On the 12th of March, the parliament assembled, and its proceedings were marked by a firmness and prudence which was little agreeable to the impetuous desires of the English king. After the important preliminaries had been gone through of confirming the choice of Arran as governor of the realm and tutor to the young queen, on the ground of his being next in succession to the crown, the Archbishop of Glasgow, then chancellor, brought forward the proposals of Henry regarding the treaty of peace, and marriage of his son, the Prince of Wales, with their infant sovereign; whilst he exhibited the instructions which were to be delivered to their ambassadors, who, it was agreed, should immediately

1 These important particulars of the meeting held at Perth by the rival lords previous to the parliament are new to Scottish history. They are collected from an original letter preserved in the State-paper Office, dated March 16, 1542-3, addressed by the Earl of Angus and his brother Sir George Douglas to Lord Lisle. It will be published in its entire state in the volume of Scottish correspondence during the reign of Henry the Eighth, which is about to be printed by Government; in the meantime a short extract may not be uninteresting to the reader:—"The Parliament began the 12th of March, and the ouke before, thare convenit in the toune of Perth th' Erles of Huntley, Ergyle, Murray, and Boithwell, with ane gret noumer of bishoppis and abbotis, baronis and knightis, and so the forsaidis lordis sent the Bischop of Orkney, and Sir John Campbell of Caldour, knycht, uncle to the Erle of Ergyle, with certaine artiklis to my lord governour and counsale being with him. Ane of the principale artiklis was to put the cardinal to liberte, and ane other was that the New Testament shuld not go abroide. The third article was that the governour shuld be usit and counsalit be thame in all th' affaires. The forde was that the ambassiatouris that ar contenit in the saufconduct come fro the kingis majeste, that thai walde not be contentit that thai shuld pas in England, but walde have others of thare chesing. My lord governour, with avise of us and of his counsale, maid thame ane final answer, That he wuld grant them no such unreasonable desires; and incontinent after the departure of the said bishop and knycht we sent one heralde of armes unto the saidis lordis at Perth, chargeing thame under the payne of trayson to cum and serue the governour, for the welth of the realme, according to their dewty and allegiance. Thir forsaid lordis pretendit to have made one partie if thai had bene able, and my lord governour and we agane preparit ourselves with all the gentilmen and servyngmen that langit unto us to ane gud nowmer, and ane weel favorit cumpany purposing to proceed in our parliament in despyte of all thame wald say the contrarie. And than the saidis lordis seeing this, that thai mycht not mak thare partye gud, th' Erle of Huntlie sent unto the governour and to us saying that he wald com, and do his dewtie to the governour, and mouche the rather for our cause, considering the proximite of blude that was betwix us. And so be our advise the governour was contentit to give him assurance to com and serve him in the said parlement, and so the said erle came in on Sunday, the 11th Marche; and on Monday the 12th of the same the erle of Murray sent and desyrit he mycht cum and serve the governour, and we acceptit him in lyk maner; and upon Twysday th' erle Boithwell sent to us ane letter and desyrit us that he mycht cum and serve the governour in this present parliament, and we movit the same to the governour, and he being contentit thairwith the said Erle Boithwell com in on Weddynsday, the 14th of this month. And all the clergy boith bischoppis and abbotis com into the said parliament upon Sounday, the 11th hereof, and all the greater men of Scotland, convenet to the said parliament boith spirituale and temporall, except the Erle of Ergyle allanerly, who is sore sick, and sent his procurator with his two uncles to mak his excuse the 15th of Marche. . . . . It has bene the moist substanciall parliament that ever was sene in Scotland in ony mannis rememberance, and best furnist with all the three estatis."

proceed to England for the negotiation of this alliance. These, however, were widely different from what Henry had expected. The parliament refused to deliver the queen till she had attained the full age of ten years; they declined to surrender any of the fortresses of the kingdom, and the whole deliberations were conducted with a jealous attention to the preservation of the liberties of Scotland as a separate and independent kingdom. That realm was to retain its name, its laws, its ancient courts, officers, and immunities. It was stipulated that, even after the marriage was concluded, whether there was issue or not, the kingdom of Scotland should continue to be governed by a native ruler; and the proviso was subjoined, that in the event of the failure of the heirs of such marriage, the nearest lawful successor should immediately succeed to the crown, without question or difficulty.[1] Under such restrictions the proposal of a matrimonial alliance was welcomed as likely to produce the most favourable effects on the mutual prosperity of both kingdoms; and Balnaves, the secretary, Sir James Learmont, the treasurer, with Sir William Hamilton of Sanquhar, were chosen as ambassadors to the court of England.

The parliament then proceeded to reverse the attainder of Angus and the Douglases, restoring them to their estates and their honours; they selected the Earls Marshal and Montrose, with the Lords Erskine, Ruthven, Lindsay, Livingston, and Seton, to be keepers of the queen's person; they appointed the governor a council, which was far too numerous to be efficient; and they determined that, for the present, the young queen should hold her court, under the eye of her mother, the queen dowager, at the palace of Linlithgow. Parliament was then prorogued to the 17th of March, whilst the committee known by the name of the Lords of the Articles continued their sittings for the introduction of such statutes as were esteemed beneficial to the general interests of the kingdom. Amongst these, one provision stands pre-eminent for its important effects in spreading the light of truth, and accelerating the progress of the Reformation. Lord Maxwell, when a prisoner in England, had become a convert to its doctrines, and proposed that all might have liberty to read the Bible in an approved Scots or English translation, provided none disputed on the controverted opinions. Against this the Archbishop of Glasgow solemnly protested for himself and the ecclesiastical estate in parliament till the matter should be debated in a provincial council; but the proposition obtained the consent of the Lords of the Articles, and was publicly ratified by the governor. Arran, indeed, was at this time esteemed, to use the words of Knox, one of the most fervent Protestants in Europe. He entertained in his service two celebrated preachers, Friar Williams and John Rough, who inveighed with much severity against the corruptions of the Romish Church; and under his protection the Holy Scriptures began to be studied very generally throughout the country.

Sadler, the English ambassador, now arrived in Edinburgh, and with great diplomatic ability earnestly laboured to obtain more favourable terms. No effort was left untried to shake the resolution and corrupt the integrity of the governor: his fears were attempted to be roused by threats of war; his ambition was worked on by the promise of a marriage between his son and the Princess Elizabeth of England; but although indolent and timid as a politician, Arran possessed a high sense of honour, and no persuasions could induce him to depart from the resolution of the three estates. Nor was Sadler more successful with others to whom he applied. In a letter to the king, written a short time after the prorogation of the parliament, he lamented that his utmost endeavours were insufficient to bring them to consent to the wishes of his master. They would rather, he assured Henry, suffer any extremity than come to the obedience and subjection of England,

[1] Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, vol. ii. pp. 411-413.

being determined to have their realm free, and to retain their ancient laws and customs; yet he acknowledged that the nobles and the whole temporality desired the marriage, and were anxious to remain at peace, whilst he expressed an opinion that this event would be followed by a renunciation of their alliance with France, and might possibly, in the progress of time, induce them to fall to the obedience and devotion of England. In the same despatch, however, the enmity of the churchmen to the marriage and union with England is represented as deep and universal.[1]

The haughty temper of the English monarch was irritated by the opposition to his favourite scheme, and the measures which he adopted were violent and impolitic. He upbraided Angus, Glencairn, and the rest of his prisoners with a breach of their promises; he assured them that he had no intention to recede from even the smallest portion of his demands, and that, if necessary, he would by force compel the Scots to deliver to him their infant queen, in which case they must prepare themselves either to return to their imprisonment in England, or assist him, according to their solemn agreement, in the conquest of the country; but an event which soon after occurred convinced him that it was easier to form than to realise such intentions. Beaton, who, since his imprisonment, had not ceased to keep up a communication with his party, contrived suddenly, and somewhat mysteriously, to recover his liberty. He had been delivered by Arran into the custody of Lord Seton, a near relative of the Hamiltons, but a nobleman distinguished for his hereditary loyalty and his attachment to the Catholic faith. This peer, if we may believe the asseverations of the governor, under pretence of inducing Beaton to deliver up his castle of St Andrews, permitted the cardinal to remove from Blackness to this fortress. Thither he was accompanied by Seton, but with so small a force, that the prelate, instead of a captive, remained master in his own palace; and as no attempt was made to punish, or even to examine his keeper, it is difficult to resist the inference that Arran was secretly not displeased at his escape.[2] Hamilton, abbot of Paisley, the natural brother of the governor, and an ecclesiastic of considerable political ability, had returned from France a short time previous to the enlargement of Beaton,[3] and was probably concerned in the plot which led to his liberation. It is at least certain that he soon exercised a considerable influence over the vacillating mind of the governor, and the cardinal endeavoured through his means to promote a coalition between their parties. He declared himself anxious, by every lawful means, to support the government, repelled with indignation the assertion that he had entered into any treasonable correspondence with France, and declared himself ready at any time to surrender his person for the trial of his innocency.[4] He even despatched his chaplain to Sadler, the English ambassador, with the object of removing from the mind of his master, the king of England, the violent prejudices which had been conceived against him. None, he affirmed, was more ready than himself to acknowledge the beneficial effects which must result from a union between the two kingdoms, to accomplish which he would serve the English monarch as sincerely as any of his supporters, with this only difference, that he would fulfil his duty to the country of which he was a subject, and anxiously provide for the preservation of its freedom and independence.[5] It is difficult to estimate the exact proportion of sincerity which entered into these professions, but the last condition was directly opposed to the imperious projects of Henry, who imagined

[1] Sir R. Sadler to one of the council of the north, dated 27th March 1543. State-paper Office. "In myn opinion they had lever suffre extremytee than com to the obediens and subjection of England—they wool have their own realm free and live within themselves after their own lawes and custumes."

[2] Sadler's State-papers, vol. i. p. 137.
[3] Ibid., vol. i. p. 117.
[4] Ibid., vol. i. p. 131.
[5] Ibid., vol. i. pp. 131, 133.

the time had arrived when Scotland was for ever to be incorporated with the English monarchy. He rejected them accordingly with ill advised precipitation; and both parties became aware that, unless some unforeseen changes took place, all hope of an amicable issue was at an end.

In the meantime, the Scottish ambassadors arrived at the English court, and on being admitted to their audience, explained to the monarch the conditions upon which the parliament were ready to give their consent to a marriage.[1] Henry declared himself deeply dissatisfied. He first insisted on the immediate delivery of the infant queen, but afterwards relaxed so far in his requisitions as to consent she should remain in her own kingdom till she had completed the age of two years. He talked idly of his right, as lord superior to the realm of Scotland,[2] and in virtue of this, contended that the government of that kingdom ought to be resigned into his hands without question or delay. Such demands the Scottish ambassadors resisted with firmness, and in a subsequent meeting with the English commissioners to confer upon the marriage, they did not conceal their opinion that the first notice of such terms would render any treaty between the two countries completely impracticable. Nor were they deceived in their expectations. The extraordinary demands of Henry were received in Scotland with a universal burst of indignation; and the anticipations of the Douglases and their faction, who had in vain besought him to unveil his designs more cautiously, were completely fulfilled. Even the governor, who was described by Sir George Douglas to Sadler as a very gentle creature, resented with becoming spirit the indignity with which he had been treated; and Beaton gained from the violence and indiscretion of his adversary a strength and popularity which some months before he had in vain attempted to acquire by his own efforts.

The cardinal was not slow in availing himself of this advantage. Some time previous to this, the Earl of Lennox had returned to Scotland by the advice of the cardinal, and with the concurrence of Francis the First, in whose Italian wars he had received his education.[3] The object of Beaton was to render Arran subservient to his designs by raising a rival to him in the Earl of Lennox. The near relationship between this young noble and the royal family, and a report which was circulated at this time, that the late king, in the event of his dying without children, had selected him as his successor in the throne, excited the jealousy and apprehensions of the governor. Beaton, on the other hand, did not scruple to encourage the ambition of Lennox by holding out the hope of a marriage with the queen-dowager; and it was even hinted by the clergy, that in consequence of some informality in the divorce between the father of Arran and his second wife, the governor, who was the issue of a third marriage, had no legitimate title either to his paternal property, or to the high office which he held. Could this have been made out, Lennox was unquestionably not only the next heir to these immense estates, but possessed, on the same grounds, a preferable claim to the regency; and it is easy to understand how all these concurring circumstances must have shaken the resolution of Arran, and rendered Lennox a formidable instrument in the hands of so artful a politician as the cardinal.[4]

These, however, were far from the only means which he employed. He had early opened a negotiation with France; and Francis the First, aware of the importance of preserving his amicable relations with Scotland, em-

[1] They set off from Edinburgh on the 23d of March 1542-3. Sadler, vol. i. p. 90.

[2] It is to be regretted that there should be a revival of this question in the present day; but to those who feel any interest in the controversy, I would recommend the able "Vindication of the Independence of Scotland," by Mr Allen. The meeting between Henry and the Scottish commissioners probably took place some time about the 10th or 12th of April.

[3] Lesley, p. 173. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 27.

[4] Maitland, vol. ii. p. 842.

powered Lennox to promise assistance, both in arms and money, to the party opposed to Henry. He took every opportunity of enlisting upon his side the affections and the prejudices of the middle and the lower classes of the people,—promulgating, through the medium of the clergy, the insolent demands of the English monarch, and exciting their resentment against those persons amongst the nobility whom he justly represented as having sold to Henry their services against their native country.

The consequences of all this were soon apparent, and appeared to promise the cardinal a speedy triumph over his enemies. Arran, the governor, in whose vacillating character there was a strong love of popularity, became alienated from the English party. He declared openly, that he would sooner abide the extremity of war than consent to the demands of Henry; and, equally irresolute in his religion as in his politics, dismissed Friar Williams and John Rough, his two Protestant chaplains, whom, till then, he had retained in his family.[1] The people, also, were now so universally opposed to the renunciation of the amity with France, that Glencairn and Cassillis did not hesitate to inform the English ambassador they would sooner die than agree to this condition. Such, indeed, was the exacerbation of national feeling upon the subject, that Sadler could not venture abroad without being exposed to insult; whilst the peers who were in the interest of Henry complained to the ambassador that their devotion to England rendered them the objects of universal hatred and contempt.[2]

To counteract, if possible, this state of things, which seemed to threaten the total wreck of his favourite schemes, Henry was prevailed upon by Sir George Douglas, who privately visited him in England, to relax in the rigour of his demands. By his advice, the immediate delivery of the infant queen, the surrender of the fortresses, and the resignation of the government into the hands of the English sovereign, were abandoned as hopeless and extravagant conditions, the mention of which had already materially injured his cause; and the artful envoy returned to Scotland with proposals for the conclusion of the peace, and marriage upon a more equitable basis.[3] He was instructed, also, to flatter the vanity of the governor, by renewing, on the part of Henry, his former proposal of a marriage between the Princess Elizabeth and Arran's eldest son; and so successfully did he labour, that, in a convention of the nobility, held in April, which, however, was principally composed of those peers and their adherents who were in the interest of England, it was resolved to despatch Sir George Douglas and the Earl of Glencairn as assistants to the ambassadors already there, in the negotiation of the treaty of marriage and alliance, which had been so abruptly broken off by the violence and arrogance of Henry.

In the meantime, the opposite party were not idle, and the talents of the cardinal were exerted against the faction of Henry with formidable success. Lennox, who, till this time, had wavered, went over to Beaton; and being admitted to an audience by the governor, delivered a flattering message from the French king, containing expressions of the warmest friendship, promising immediate assistance in troops and money, should England attempt an invasion, and declaring his resolution to preserve the ancient league between the two kingdoms as the firmest basis of their mutual prosperity.[4] This proposal Arran, for the present, evaded by a general answer; but the cardinal, the queen-dowager, and their friends, did not lose the opportunity. They entered into a nego-

[1] Sadler's State-papers, vol. i. p. 158.
[2] Ibid., p. 165.
[3] In the State-paper Office are preserved two original documents, containing the instructions given to Sir George Douglas. One of them, dated May 1, 1543, is a short paper in the handwriting of Secretary Wriothesley. It is thus entitled: "The be th' articles which he thought so reasonable, that if the ambassadors of Scotland will not agree to them, then it shall be mete the king's majestie folowe out his purpose by force."
[4] Sadler, vol. i. p. 163.

tiation with France, in which it was agreed that a force of two thousand men, under the command of Montgomerie, Sieur de Lorges, an officer of high military reputation, should be sent to Scotland; they encouraged their friends and adherents, by the hopes of powerful subsidies, to assemble their forces, garrison their castles, and keep themselves in readiness for the impending struggle; whilst Grimani, the Papal legate, with the still formidable weapons of ecclesiastical anathemas and processes of excommunication, was invited to accelerate his journey into Scotland. A convention of the clergy, at the same time, assembled at St Andrews, in which the probability of a war with England was discussed, and a resolution carried to ascertain and levy, without delay, the sum required in such an exigency. The assembly was pervaded with the utmost unanimity and enthusiasm; the cause which they were called upon to support was represented as not only that of the Church, but of their ancient freedom and national independence; the hearts of the people, and the patriotic feelings of the great majority of the nobility, responded to the sentiments which were uttered; and the clergy declared their readiness, not only to sacrifice their whole private fortunes, but to melt down the Church plate, and, were it necessary, themselves fight in the quarrel.[1]

In the midst of all this opposition, the diplomatic talents of Sir George Douglas were unremittingly exerted to overcome the complicated difficulties which stood in the way of a general conciliation; and having returned from England with the ultimate resolutions of Henry, they were agreed to by the governor and a majority of the nobility, in a convention held at Edinburgh in the beginning of June.[2] Satisfied with this approval, although the absence of the cardinal, and many of the most influential peers, might have assured him that it would afterwards be questioned, he returned with expedition to England, and, along with the Earl of Glencairn and the Scottish ambassadors, Learmont, Hamilton, and Balnaves, met the commissioners of the sister country at Greenwich, where the treaties of pacification and marriage were finally arranged on the 1st of July.[3] The terms were certainly far more favourable than those which had been at first proposed by the English monarch. It was agreed that a marriage should take place between the Prince of Wales and Mary, queen of Scots, as soon as that princess had reached majority, and that an inviolable peace should subsist between the kingdoms during the lives of these two royal persons, which was to continue for a year after the death of the first who should pay the debt of nature. Till she had completed her tenth year, the young Mary was to remain in Scotland under the care of the guardians appointed by the parliament; Henry being permitted to send thither an English nobleman, with his wife and attendants, to form part of the household of the princess. Within a month after she entered her eleventh year, the estates of Scotland solemnly promised to deliver their princess at Berwick to the commissioners appointed to receive her; and as hostages for the fulfilment of this condition, two earls and four barons were to be sent forthwith to England. It was carefully provided that, even if the queen should have issue by the prince, the kingdom of Scotland should retain its name, and be governed by its ancient laws. It had been earnestly desired that the treaty should include a positive abrogation of the long-established league between France and Scotland; but instead of being "friends to friends, and enemies to enemies," the utmost that could be procured was the insertion of a clause, by which it was agreed that neither should afford assistance to any foreign aggressor, notwithstanding any former stipulation upon this subject.

It is apparent that, in this treaty, Henry abandoned the most obnoxious part of his demands; and had the

[1] Sadler's State-papers, vol. i. p. 204.
[2] Ibid., pp. 212, 213.
[3] Rymer, Fœdera, vol. xiv. pp. 786-791.

English monarch, and the Scottish nobles who were in his interest, acted with good faith, little ground of objection to the proposed marriage and pacification could have been left to their opponents. But, whilst such were all the articles which *openly* appeared, a private transaction, or "*secret device*," as it is termed in the original papers which now, for the first time, reveal its existence, was entered into between Henry and his partisans, Maxwell, Glencairn, Angus, and the rest, which was at once of a very unjustifiable description, and calculated to exasperate their adversaries in a high degree. An agreement appears to have been drawn up by the English commissioners, for the signature of the Scottish peers and barons taken at the Solway, by which they once more tied themselves to his service; and, forgetting their allegiance to their natural prince, promised, in the event of any commotion in Scotland, to adhere solely to the interest of the English monarch, "so that he should attain all the things then pacted and covenanted, or, at the least, the dominion on this side the Firth."[1] In the same treaty the precise sums of ransom to be exacted from the Scottish prisoners taken at the Solway were fixed by the commissioners; but, before they were permitted to avail themselves of this means for the recovery of their liberty, it appears to have been a condition, that they should sign this agreement which has been above described. In the meantime, the negotiations having been concluded, peace was soon afterwards proclaimed between the two countries, and the ambassadors returned to Edinburgh with the hope that the treaties would immediately be ratified by the governor and the parliament.

To their mortification, however, they discovered that, in the interval of their absence, Beaton, who had in all probability obtained information of this second combination of Henry and his Scottish prisoners against the independence of the country, had succeeded in consolidating a formidable opposition. The English monarch had at this moment resolved on a war with France; and any delay in the proposed alliance with Scotland inflamed the haughty impatience of his temper. His resentment against the cardinal, with whose practices Sadler his ambassador did not fail to acquaint him, now rose to a high pitch, and he repeatedly urged the governor and his partisans to seize and imprison the prelate. Such, however, were the vigilance and ability of this energetic ecclesiastic, that he not only escaped the snares, but for a while defeated the utmost efforts of his enemies; and many of the nobles, becoming aware of the plots which were in agitation for the subjugation of Scotland, eagerly joined his party, and prepared by arms to assert their freedom. With this object the cardinal and the Earl of Huntly concentrated their forces in the north, Argyle and Lennox in the west, whilst Bothwell, Home, and the Laird of Buccleuch, mustered their feudal array upon the Borders.[2] They declared that they were compelled to adopt these measures for the protection of the faith and holy Church, and the defence of the independence of the realm, which had been sold to Henry by Arran, whom they stigmatised as a heretic and an Englishman.[3] So far as it concerned the preservation of what they believed the only true

[1] The proof of this transaction is to be found in a paper preserved in the State-paper Office, and dated July 1, 1543, entitled, "Copy of the Secret Devise." It contains this passage:—"Fourthly, if ther happen any division or trouble to arise in Scotland, by practice of the cardinal, kyrkmen, France, or otherwise, I shall sticke and adhere only to the king's majesty's service, as his highness maye assuredly atteyne these things noe pacted and covenanted, or, at the least, the domynion on this side the Freythe." This explains an obscure passage in Sadler's State-papers, vol. i. p. 237, "The said Earl of Angus hath subscribed the articles *of the devise* which your majesty sent unto me with your last letters, and the Lord Maxwell telleth me that, as soon as he received the like articles from your majesty by his son, he forthwith subscribed the same. The rest I have not yet spoken with, because they be not here, but as soon as I can I shall not fail to accomplish that part according to your gracious commandment."

[2] Sadler, vol. i. p. 236.

[3] Ibid., pp. 233, 234.

faith, their opposition was defeated; whilst the great cause of the Reformation, gaining ground by slow degrees, was destined to be ultimately triumphant. But it is not to be denied that their accusations regarding the sacrifice of the liberty of the country by its weak governor, were founded in justice. We know from the high authority of Sadler the English ambassador, that Arran boasted of his English descent; that he eagerly received the money sent him by Henry, and professed his anxiety for the accomplishment of all his desires. Nor was this all: he entertained, though he did not accept, a proposal of the English monarch to make him King of Scotland beyond the Firth; and he proposed that, in the event of the cardinal becoming too powerful for him, an army should be sent to invade the country, with which he and his friends might effectually co-operate, alleging that by this means, although forsaken by their countrymen, he doubted not that the whole realm might be forcibly reduced under the subjection of England.[1] It is not matter of surprise, therefore, that Beaton, as soon as he became aware of this disposition, of the urgent desire of Henry for the seizure of his person, and of the still more dangerous intrigues of the Scottish prisoners for the subjugation of the realm, should have exerted every effort to defeat their intentions.

So bitter and indignant indeed were his feelings, that, if we may believe an extraordinary story which is found in a letter of the Duke of Suffolk to Sir R. Sadler, the cardinal had challenged Sir Ralph Eure, warden of the marches, to a personal combat, on some ground of quarrel which does not appear. The challenge was communicated to Henry, who, considering it in a serious light, intimated his wishes that Eure should fight with Beaton in Edinburgh. The whole matter evinces the credulity of the English ambassador and his royal master, for we cannot believe that the prelate could have contemplated so disgraceful an adventure; and the conjecture of Suffolk, that it originated in the insolence of a moss-trooper, whom he characterises as one of the strongest Border-thieves in Scotland, is probably not far from the truth.[2]

During these transactions the young queen remained in the palace of Linlithgow, under the nominal charge of the queen-dowager, but so strictly guarded by the governor and the Hamiltons, that her residence was little else than an honourable imprisonment. To obtain possession of her person was now the first object of the cardinal's party; and, whether by the connivance of her immediate guardians, or from some relaxation in the vigilance of Arran, they at last succeeded. Marching from Stirling at the head of a force of ten thousand men, Lennox, Huntly, and Argyle proceeded towards the capital, and were joined at Leith by Bothwell, with the Kers and the Scotts, forming a combined army, which Arran and the Douglases did not find themselves able to resist. After an ineffectual attempt to temporise, which was defeated by the energy of his opponents, the governor consented to surrender his royal charge; and the infant queen, with the queen-dowager, who secretly rejoiced at the change, were conducted by Lennox in triumph to Stirling.[3]

1 Sadler, vol. i. pp. 216, 253, 256.

2 Letter in State-paper Office, Duke of Suffolk and the Bishop of Durham to Sir Ralph Sadler, July 15, 1543:—"For we cannot thinke the cardinal wolde be so madde as to provoke and challenge any man that wolde fighte with him in the quarrell, or that he intends to fight, onelesse he shall thinke himselfe to be farre the stronger partie, and yet then we thinke he wolde stande alouff and look on rather than to come himselfe among knocks. We thinke rather this bragge is made by Clement Crosier, himselfe being one of the strongest thieves in Scotland, to stirre besynes and to lett the good peax, than that the cardinall was so madde to bydde him meddle in any such matter." Also letter in State-paper Office, July 20, 1543, Duke of Suffolk and the Privy-council to Lord Parr, touching the challenge.

3 Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, p. 28. A valuable volume lately printed by the Bannatyne Club, from which the erroneous chronology of our general historians of this period may be sometimes corrected. It contains the best account of this transaction, the delivery of the queen, upon which Bu-

To Beaton this was an important accession of strength; and having so far succeeded in weakening his adversaries, he laboured to detach the governor from England, by holding out the prospect of a marriage between his son and the young Mary. Arran however resisted, or suspected the splendid bribe; and, in a convention of the nobles which was held on the 25th of August, in the abbey church of Holyrood, the treaties with England were ratified with solemn pomp, the governor swearing to their observance at the altar.[1] To this transaction, however, the cardinal and the powerful nobles with whom he acted were no parties. Not long before, they had remonstrated in strong terms against the mode of government pursued by Arran. They complained that, in the weightiest affairs of the realm, he was guided by the advice of a particular faction, excluding from his councils many of the highest nobles; and they warned him that, as long as this course was adopted, they would not consider themselves bound by their partial deliberations.[2] They insisted that the ratification of the treaties had been carried by private means, unauthorised by the authority of parliament, contrary to the opinion of a majority of the nobles, and to the wishes of the great body of the people; nor did they omit any method by which they might render Arran suspected and unpopular.

These devices began soon to produce the desired effect; and this was accelerated by one of those rash measures into which Henry was so frequently hurried by the impetuosity of his temper. Soon after the proclamation of peace, the Scottish merchants, who then carried on a lucrative foreign commerce, had despatched a fleet of merchantmen, which sought shelter from a storm in an English port. Here they deemed themselves secure; but, to their astonishment, they were detained, and, under the pretext that they were carrying provisions into France, their cargoes were confiscated; a proceeding which so highly irritated the populace of Edinburgh, that they surrounded the house of the English ambassador, and threatened his life, in case their ships were not restored.[3]

This last act of injustice and spoliation was attributed to the governor, who was known to be in the interest of Henry; and he began to feel that his subserviency had made him odious to all respectable classes in the community, and to dread, when it was almost too late, that he had engaged in a desperate enterprise. His friends, Angus, Cassillis, and Glencairn, with other barons attached to England, proposed to assemble their forces and prepare for immediate war; the time, they basely declared, was come, when Henry must send a main army into Scotland, with which they might cooperate in his conquest of the realm;[4] and such was the exasperation of the two factions, that, in the opinion of the English ambassador, a hostile collision was impossible to be avoided. It was averted, however, by a revolution as sudden as it was extraordinary. On the 28th of August the governor, in an interview with Sir Ralph Sadler, expressed an entire devotedness to Henry, declaring that no prince alive should have his heart and service but the English monarch. On the 3d of September, before a week had elapsed, he met the cardinal at Callander House, the seat of Lord Livingston; all causes of animosity were removed, and a complete reconciliation with the prelate took place. Beaton, who a few days before had declined any con-

chanan, Lesley, Maitland, and other historians are obscure and contradictory.

[1] Sadler, vol. i. p. 270. August 25, 1543.

[2] Ibid., p. 251.

[3] In the State-paper Office is a draft of a letter, dated 9th of September 1543, from the English king, in the handwriting of Wriothesley, secretary of state, threatening the magistrates of Edinburgh, to whom it is addressed, with punishment, if they maltreated his ambassador, in consequence of the seizure of the ships.

[4] As this expression, "the conquest of the realm," coming from Scottish nobles, against their country, may seem unnaturally strong, it is right to observe that the words are not the author's but their own, as reported by the English ambassadors. Sadler, vol. i. pp. 257, 281.

ference, alleging that his life was in danger, rode amicably with him to Stirling, and soon acquired so complete a command over his pliant character, that he publicly abjured his religion in the Franciscan convent of that city, received absolution for his having wandered from the Catholic faith,[1] renounced the treaties with England, and delivered his eldest son to the cardinal as a pledge of his sincerity. Such was the conclusion of this remarkable coalition: its causes are of more difficult discovery, but are probably to be traced to the secret influence of the Abbot of Paisley, bastard brother of Arran, and a zealous adherent of the cardinal, who had lately arrived from France. This able ecclesiastic is said to have secretly persuaded the governor, that, by his friendship with England, and his renunciation of the Papal supremacy, he was undermining his own title to the government, and to his paternal estates, which rested on a divorce, dependent for its validity on the maintenance of the authority of the Holy See. Arran, at no time distinguished by much penetration or resolution, took the alarm, and, believing it his only security, consented to a union with Beaton, whom he never afterwards deserted.[2]

Encouraged by this success, the cardinal and the governor earnestly laboured to bring over to their party the Earl of Angus and his associates. They entreated them to attend the approaching coronation of the young queen, to assist, by their presence and experience, in the parliament, and thus to restore unity to the commonwealth; but this proud and selfish potentate and his confederates only replied by sullenly retiring to Douglas castle, where they assembled their forces, and drew up a bond or covenant, by which they agreed to employ their utmost united strength in fulfilling their engagements to the English king.[3] This paper, as an evidence of their sincerity, they intrusted to Lord Somerville, who agreed to deliver it to Henry, and to concert measures for the extirpation of their enemies. In the meantime, the ceremony of the coronation took place at Stirling; a new council was appointed; the governor took an oath that he would administer the affairs of the kingdom by their advice; and it was resolved that a convention should be shortly held at Edinburgh, in which all disputes with England relative to the non-performance of the treaties might be calmly discussed, and, if possible, equitably adjusted.

From the temper, however, in which Henry received the intelligence of this great change in Scotland, little calmness on his side could be expected. In a paroxysm of indignation he despatched a herald into that country, denouncing war if the treaties were not immediately fulfilled.[4] He addressed a letter to the magistrates of Edinburgh, threatening them with severe retribution should they permit the populace to offer violence to his ambassador; he commanded his warden, Sir Thomas Wharton, to liberate the chiefs of the Armstrongs, who were then his prisoners, on condition of their directing the fury of their Border war against the estates of those Scottish lords who opposed him; and he determined on the invasion of Scotland with an overwhelming force, as soon as he could muster his power, and make arrangements for its subsistence.[5]

In the late transactions the Earl of Lennox had acted a conspicuous part, and his high birth and powerful connexions were of essential service to the cardinal; but having gained the governor Beaton, with less than his usual foresight, began to look coldly on him; and Lennox, whose conduct was solely regulated by considerations of interest, deserted the cause which he had hitherto supported, and threw himself into

[1] MS. Letter in the Hamilton Papers, Lord William Parr to the Duke of Suffolk, September 13, 1543, quoted in Chalmers's Life of Mary, vol. ii. p. 404.
[2] Sadler, vol. i. pp. 282, 283.
[3] Ibid., p. 288.
[4] Credence of the English herald sent into Scotland, State-paper Office, September 1543.
[5] Duke of Suffolk to Lord Parr, Darnton, September 10, 1543; and same to same, September 11, 1543, State-paper Office.

the arms of England.[1] This defection was attended with serious results. To Lennox had hitherto been committed the negotiations with France, and, in consequence of his advice, a French ambassador, the Sieur de la Brosse, was despatched to Scotland, accompanied by a small fleet, bearing military stores, fifty pieces of artillery, and ten thousand crowns,[2] to be distributed amongst the friends of the cardinal. Ignorant of the sudden change in the politics of the Scottish earl, the squadron anchored off Dumbarton, the town and fortress of which were entirely in his power; and Lennox, hurrying thither with Glencairn, one of the ablest and least scrupulous partisans of Henry, received the gold, secured it in the castle, and left the ambassador to find out his mistake when it was irremediable.

But, although mortified by this untoward event, the arrival of the French fleet brought fresh hope and renewed strength to the cardinal and the queen-dowager. Along with La Brosse came a papal legate, Grimani, patriarch of Aquileia, commissioned to take cognisance of the heretical opinions which had infected the Scottish Church, and to confirm the governor in his adherence to the Catholic religion. He remained during the winter in Scotland, entertained by the court and the nobles with much hospitality and barbaric pomp; and in the spring he returned to the Continent, bearing with him a favourable impression of this remote kingdom. Another object of the patriarch was, to advise the renewal of the league with France; nor could any measure be more agreeable to the body of the people. They were aware of the determination of Henry to invade and attempt the conquest of the country; they were incensed to the highest degree by the detention of their ships; the rekindling of the war upon the Borders had recalled all their martial propensities; and Sadler, soon after the arrival of the French fleet, informed his royal master, that such had been the effect of the promises and pensions of the ambassador, who had been received with great distinction at court, that the whole realm was entirely in the French interest. According to the representations of this able minister, the people of Scotland could not conceal from themselves that France required nothing but friendship, and had always assisted them at their utmost need, in their efforts to maintain the honour and liberty of the country; whilst England sought to bring them into subjection, and asserted a superiority, which, he added, from their heart they so universally detested and abhorred, that unless by open force, it was vain to look for their consent.[3]

To this last fatal appeal matters appeared to be now rapidly approaching. Henry, irritated by the defeat of his favourite schemes, rose in his unreasonable demands in proportion to the opposition he experienced. Denouncing vengeance against the devoted country, he informed Angus and his faction, that the time was past when he was willing to accept the treaties, and that nothing now would satisfy him but the possession of the person of the young queen, the seizure of his arch-enemy the cardinal, the removal of the governor, and the delivery into his hands of the principal fortresses of the kingdom. His wisest councillors, however, dissuaded him from immediate invasion; to the cardinal and the governor, some time was also required for the assembling of their forces; and thus an interval of brief and insincere negotiation preceded the breaking out of hostilities.

It was at this time that Sadler, the ambassador, was instructed to propose to the Scottish merchants, whose ships had been unjustly detained, the restitution of their property, under the condition that they would assist the English monarch in the execution of his projects against the independence of their country. These brave and honest men, however, spurned at the proposal, with which they declared themselves greatly offended, affirming that they would not only lose their

[1] Sadler, vol. i. p. 299.
[2] Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, p. 28.
[3] Sadler, vol. i. p. 326. October 30, 1543.

goods and ships without farther suit or petition, but would willingly forfeit their lives, rather than agree to a condition which would make them traitors to their native land: a memorable contrast to the late conduct of the nobility, and a proof that the spirit of national independence, which, in Scotland, had long been a stranger to many of the proudest in the aristocracy, still resided in healthy vigour in the untainted bosoms of the commons.[1]

Where such principles animated the body of the people, it was no easy matter for Henry to succeed; and the exasperation of the nation was increased by the seizure of the Lords Somerville and Maxwell, the principal agents of Angus in conducting his intrigues with England. Upon the person of Somerville was found the bond signed at Douglas, along with letters which disclosed the plans of the party; and as it was evident they were ready to assist Henry in the entire subjugation of the country, their opponents abandoned all measures of conciliation, and resolved to proceed with the utmost severity against the Douglases and their party. Maxwell and Somerville were imprisoned; the governor and the cardinal determined to assemble a parliament early in December; and, as the intercepted packet contained ample evidence of treason, it was agreed that its first business should be the impeachment and forfeiture of Angus and his adherents. Alarmed at such a design, these barons assembled their forces, with the idea that they would be strong enough to bring about a revolution before the meeting of the estates; but in this they were disappointed. The governor, acting by the advice of Beaton, at once resolved on war, seized Dalkeith and Pinkie, two of the chief houses of the Douglases, and sent a herald to Tantallon, where Sadler had taken refuge, commanding Angus to dismiss from his castle one whom they could no longer regard as the ambassador of England, considering his false practices with the nobility in this time of war.[2]

Meanwhile the parliament assembled, to which the full attendance of the three Estates, the presence of the papal legate, and the grave and weighty subjects to be debated, gave unusual solemnity. The first step taken by the cardinal convinced all that the day of weak and vacillating councils was past. A summons of treason was prepared against the Earl of Angus, and those of his party who had signed the bond in Douglas castle; and the treaties of peace and marriage lately concluded with Henry the Eighth, were declared at an end, in consequence of the unjust conduct of the English monarch in seizing the Scottish ships,[3] and refusing to ratify the peace, although it had been confirmed by the oath and seal of the regent of the kingdom. The French ambassadors, De la Brosse and Mesnaige, were then introduced, and delivered the message of their royal master: they represented Francis as anxious for the renewal of the alliance between the two countries, and declared he had empowered them to tender his immediate assistance in the defence of the liberty of the realm and its youthful queen, against the unwarranted designs of England. This offer was enthusiastically accepted; the cardinal and a select council were directed to revise and renew the treaties which had so long united the realms of France and Scotland; Secretary Panter, and Campbell of Lundy, proceeded on a mission to the French court; and a kinsman of the regent was despatched to solicit the assistance of Denmark. Envoys at the same time were sent to the court of the emperor and the Duke of Bavaria, conveying the intelligence of the war with England, and requesting them, on this ground, to abstain from all further molestation of the Scottish commerce. Hamilton, abbot of Paisley, whose exertions had been of essential service to the government, was rewarded by the office of treasurer, from which Sir William

[1] Sadler, vol. i. p. 324.

[2] Letter, Earl of Arran to Earl of November 17, 1543, State-paper Office. Proclamation of Arran as governor, State-paper Office, Nov. 26, 1543.

[3] Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, p. 30.

Kirkaldy of Grange, a keen supporter of England, was ejected; whilst the cardinal was promoted to the dignity of chancellor, in the room of Dunbar, archbishop of Glasgow.[1]

During the period that Arran the governor professed the reformed opinions, and maintained in his family the two friars, Williams and Rough, many who had before embraced their doctrines in secret were encouraged to declare openly their animosity to the Church of Rome, and the necessity of a thorough reformation; the study of the Holy Scriptures had been authorised by the parliament; books which treated of true as distinguished from corrupt religion were imported from England, and, although little relished by the nobility, as we learn from Sadler, were, in all probability, highly welcome to the middle and lower classes of the people. By such methods the seeds of reformation were very generally disseminated throughout the country. Sixteen years had now elapsed since the cruel burning of Hamilton; but the courage with which Russel and Kennedy had defended their principles at the stake, was still fresh in the recollection of the people; and although inimical to the designs of Glencairn, Somerville, Maxwell, and the Protestant lords, for the subjection of the country under the dominion of England, they were disposed to listen with a favourable ear to their denunciations of the corruptions of the Church.

Arran, however, in renouncing the ties which had bound him to Henry, had, as we have seen, at the same time abjured his former convictions, and being again received into the bosom of the Church, was induced by Beaton to renew the persecution of the reformers. In the parliament which annulled the treaties with England, an act was passed, declaring that complaints were daily made to the governor against the heretics, who began more and more to multiply in the realm, disseminating opinions contrary to the true faith; and all prelates were enjoined to make inquisition within their dioceses for such persons, and to proceed against them according to the laws of holy Church. The expectation, however, of an immediate invasion by England protracted, for a short season, the execution of this cruel decree; and the dissensions which followed between the governor and the Douglases, the leaders of the English or Protestant party, gave a breathing time to the sincere disciples of the Reformation.

Into any minute detail of those intrigues which occupied the interval between the meeting of parliament and the commencement of the war, it would be tedious to enter. The picture which they present of the meanness and dishonesty of the English party, who have reaped in the pages of some of our historians so high a meed of praise, as the advocates of the Protestant doctrines, is very striking. To escape the sentence of forfeiture to which their repeated treasons had exposed them, the Earls of Lennox, Angus, Cassillis, and Glencairn, who had lately bound themselves by a written covenant to the service of the King of England, did not hesitate to transmit to Arran a similar bond or agreement, conceived in equally solemn terms, by which they stipulated for "themselves and all others their complices and partakers, to remain true, faithful, and obedient servants to their sovereign lady and her authority, to assist the lord governor for defence of the realm against their old enemies of England, to support the liberties of holy Church, and to maintain the true Christian faith."[2] To this treaty with the governor, Angus gave in his adherence on the 13th of January, and to their faithful performance of its conditions, his brother, Sir George Douglas, and Glencairn's eldest son, the Master of Kilmaurs, surrendered themselves as pledges; yet two months did not expire before we find Angus once more addressing a letter to Henry,

[1] Maitland, vol. ii. p. 854.

[2] Agreements (January 13 and 14, 1543-4) entered into by the Earls of Cassillis, Angus, Lennox, and Glencairn, with the Earl of Arran, governor of Scotland. MS. copy, State-paper Office.

assuring him of his inviolable fidelity, whilst, at the same time, the nobles, who had so lately bound themselves to Arran and the cardinal, despatched a messenger to court, with an earnest request that the English monarch would accelerate his preparations for the invasion of the country, transmitting minute instructions regarding the conduct of the enterprise.[1] A main army, they advised, should proceed by land; a strong fleet, with an additional force on board, was to be despatched by sea; whilst it would be of service, it was observed, to send ten or twelve ships to the west sea, to produce a diversion in the Earl of Argyle's country,—an advice in which we may probably detect the selfish policy of Glencairn, his rival, and personal enemy. A stratagem of the same kind had already been attended with success, when, at the suggestion of the same baron, the Highland chiefs shut up in the castles of Edinburgh and Dunbar were let loose by the governor Arran, under the condition that they would direct their fury against the country of Argyle.[2] Henry, with much earnestness, was urged to attempt this before the expected aid could arrive from France; and we shall soon perceive that, on some points, their instructions were faithfully followed.[3]

[1] Letter, Angus to Henry, 5th of March 1543-4, State-paper Office. Also Earl of Hertford to the king, March 8, 1543-4, State-paper Office.

[2] Sadler, vol. i. pp. 267-275. Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, vol. ii. p. 450.

[3] The above particulars, which are new to this obscure portion of our history, are derived from authentic letters preserved in the State-paper Office. In one of these, from the Earl of Hertford to the king, dated March 8, 1543-4, is this passage: "The cheif cause of his [the messenger spoken of in the text] repayr nowe to your majesty is, to accelerate your royal army and power into Scotland, which all your majesties friends there do specially desire." The letter proceeds to state, that those noblemen, who were the king's friends, directed Henry "to send a mayne armey by land, and a convenyant armey by sea, to repayre to Leith, and bring victuals for the land armey, and to send ten or twelve ships into the west sey to do some annoyance to the Erle of Argyle." Also Letter, March 5, 1543-4, Erle of Angus to Henry the Eighth, State-paper Office.

In the meantime, all things succeeding to his wishes in the civil affairs of the government, Beaton found leisure to make an ecclesiastical progress to Perth, where the reformed opinions were openly professed by some of the citizens, and on his arrival, he commenced his proceedings with a ferocity of persecution, which ultimately defeated its object. Four men, Lamb, Anderson, Ranald, and Hunter, were convicted of heresy, on the information of Spence, a friar. The crime of Lamb was his interrupting this ecclesiastic during a sermon, and his denying that prayer to the saints was a necessary means of salvation; his three associates were accused of treating with ignominious ridicule an image of St Francis, and of breaking their fast during Lent. A poor woman, also, the wife of one of these sufferers, was dragged before the inquisitorial tribunal on a charge, that, during her labour, she had refused to pray to the Virgin, declaring she would direct her prayers to God alone, in the name of Christ; and, notwithstanding the utmost intercession made to spare their lives, all suffered death. The men were hanged; and much impression was made on the people by the last words of Lamb, who, in strong language warned them against the abominations of Popery, and its voluptuous supporters—a denunciation to which the well-known profligacy of the cardinal gave no little force; yet the chief sympathy was excited by the fate of the unfortunate woman. She entreated, as a last request, to be allowed to die with her husband; but this was denied, and, according to a savage distinction in the executions of these times, she was condemned to be drowned. "It matters not, dear partner," said she, "we have lived together many happy days, but this ought to be the most joyful of them all, when we are about to have joy for ever; therefore I will not bid you good night, for ere the night shall close we shall be united in the kingdom of heaven." She then gave the little infant, who still hung upon her breast, to the attendants, held out her

hands to be bound by the executioners, saw without any change of countenance her feet secured in the same manner, and was cast into a deep pool of water, where her sufferings were ended in a moment. Such atrocious and short-sighted cruelty only strengthened the convictions which they were intended to extinguish.[1]

Henry was now busy with the organisation of his projected invasion. It was the advice of the Earl of Hertford that the army should first make themselves masters of Leith, and fortifying that seaport, proceed to ravage the country and burn the capital, whilst the fleet kept possession of the Forth, and co-operated in the destruction of the coast and shipping; but, fortunately for the Scots, a more rapid, though less fatal, mode of operations was chosen by the privy council.[2]

In the interval of preparation, the monarch, whose passions were now excited to the utmost pitch against the cardinal, to whom he justly ascribed the total failure of his schemes, lent himself to a conspiracy, the object of which was the apprehension or assassination of his powerful enemy. The history of this plot presents an extraordinary picture of the times, and demands more than common attention. On the 17th of April, Crichton, laird of Brunston,[3] who, since the coalition between Beaton and the governor, had been employed by Sadler the ambassador as a spy upon their movements, despatched to the Earl of Hertford, then at Newcastle, a Scottish gentleman named Wishart, who communicated to Hertford the particulars of the intended plot. He stated that Kirkaldy the laird of Grange, the Master of Rothes, eldest son to the earl of that name, and John Charteris, were willing to apprehend or slay the cardinal, if assured of proper support from England. Wishart, who brought this offer, was instantly despatched by post to the English court, and, in a personal interview with the king, informed him of the services which Kirkaldy and Rothes were ready to perform. Henry received the letters of Brunston, and listened to the report of his messenger with much satisfaction, approved of the plot, and, in the event of its being successful, promised the conspirators his royal protection, should they be constrained to take refuge in his dominions.[4] But Beaton had either received secret information of the project for his destruction, or the design was, for the present, interrupted by some unforeseen occurrence. Succeeding events, however, demonstrated that it was delayed only, not abandoned, and that the same unscrupulous agents who now intrigued with the English monarch were at last induced by Henry to accomplish their atrocious purpose.

It was now the end of April, and having concentrated his naval and military power, the English king at last let loose his vengeance on the devoted country. On the 1st of May, a fleet of two hundred sail, under the command of Lord Lisle, high-admiral of England, appeared in the Firth, and the citizens, after anxiously gazing for a short time at the unusual spectacle, on a nearer inspection found their worst fears realised, by discovering the royal flag of England streaming from the mast head of the admiral. For such a surprisal it seems extraordinary that the governor was unprepared, although Henry's intentions must have been well known. A very inferior force might have successfully attacked the English in their disembarkation, but the opportunity was lost; four days were allowed Hertford, who landed his army and his artillery at his leisure; and it was not till he was advancing from Granton craig to Leith, that Arran and the cardinal, at the head of a force hastily levied, and consisting chiefly of their personal adherents, threw themselves between the enemy and this place as

[1] Spottiswood's History, p. 75.

[2] See Illustrations, letter A.

[3] The house of Brunston was situated on the Esk, near Musselburgh.

[4] Letter, Orig. Earl of Hertford and Council of the North to the king—in possession of his Grace the Duke of Hamilton: the original draft, with many corrections, is in the State-paper Office. See Remarks on the Assassination of Cardinal Beaton, Illustrations, letter B.

if they meant to dispute the passage. They were immediately repulsed, however, by the superior force of Hertford, and Leith was given up to the plunder of the army without a struggle. Although deserted by the governor, the inhabitants of Edinburgh flew to arms, and mustering under the command of Otterburn of Reidhall, the provost of the city, barricaded the gates, and determined to defend themselves. Otterburn, however, was first despatched to the English camp, and, in an interview with Hertford, remonstrated against such unlooked-for hostilities, and proposed an amicable adjustment of all differences. It was answered by the English earl, that he came as a soldier, not an ambassador; that his commission commanded him to ravage the country with fire and sword; nor could he withdraw his army under any other condition than the delivery of the young queen into the hands of his master. Such a message was received with much indignation by the citizens. They declared they would rather submit to the last extremities than purchase safety by so ignominious a course, and prepared to sustain the onset of the enemy, when they were deserted by their chief magistrate, who either dreaded so unequal a contest, or had been brought over to the English party.[1] Upon this they retreated into the city, chose a new provost, completed their temporary ramparts, and for a while not only sustained the assault of Hertford, but ultimately compelled him to retire to Leith for the purpose of bringing up his battering ordnance. But a contest so unequal could not last. Arran, Huntly, Argyle, and the cardinal had retreated to Linlithgow; and to have attempted to defend the gates against the heavy ordnance, without hopes of assistance, would have been folly. During the night, therefore, the citizens, removing with them all their transportable wealth, silently abandoned the town; but Hamilton of Stenhouse resolutely defended the castle, and Hertford, after an unavailing attempt to construct a battery, which was dismounted by the superior fire of the garrison, was compelled to raise the siege, and content himself by giving the city to the flames. Its conflagration lasted for three days; and the English army, having been reinforced by four thousand Border horse under Lord Eure, employed themselves in ravaging and plundering the adjacent country with an unsparing cruelty, which they knew would be acceptable to their master the king, and which was not soon forgotten by the inhabitants.

It was now the 15th of May, and the governor having assembled an army, and liberated the Earl of Angus and his brother, George Douglas, in the hope that all party differences might be forgotten[2] in a determination to repel the common enemy, was rapidly advancing to give them battle, when Lord Lisle, setting fire to Leith, re-embarked a portion of the army, and instantly set sail, leaving the remainder of the host to return by land under Hertford. Before weighing anchor, the English admiral seized two large Scottish ships, the Salamander and the Unicorn, and destroyed by fire all the smaller craft which lay in the harbour; nor did he omit to plunder of its maritime wealth every creek or harbour which lay within reach, as he sailed along the coast. The land army was equally remorseless in its retreat. Seton, Haddington, Dunbar, and Renton were successively given to the flames; and thus ended an expedition as cruel as it was impolitic, which only increased in the Scots the virulence of the national antipathy, and rendered more distant any prospect of a cordial union between the two kingdoms.

Henry, as it is well observed by Lord Herbert, had done too much for a suitor, and too little for a conqueror.

[1] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 31. Otterburn had been long a secret tamperer with England in the minority of James the Fifth, and during the reign of that monarch.

[2] So innate was George Douglas's disposition to intrigue, that soon after his liberation he had a private interview in Leith with the Earl of Hertford, and gave him advice concerning the conduct of the expedition. Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, vol. ii. p. 451.

In the violence of his resentment he had given orders that no protection should be afforded to the estates even of his Scottish friends, and the lands of the Douglases were wasted as mercilessly as those of their enemies. The effects of this short-sighted policy were soon seen in the splitting of that Anglo-Scottish party, which had so long supported the interests of the English monarch. Angus, George Douglas, and their numerous and powerful adherents, joined the cardinal, and the only friends left to England were the Earls of Lennox and Glencairn; the first, a small acquisition, a man of weak, selfish, and versatile character; but the other, one of the ablest and most powerful barons in Scotland, whose son, the Master of Kilmaurs, from his spirit and military experience, was well fitted to execute the plans which the judgment of the father had matured. Such, indeed, was the great power and influence of Glencairn in the west of Scotland, that, in the event of a former invasion contemplated by Henry in 1543, he undertook to convey his army from Carlisle to Glasgow, without stroke or challenge;[1] and so faithful had he remained to these principles, that only a few days after the retreat of Hertford, we find him engaged in a negotiation which, considering the cruel ravages then inflicted by the English army, reflects little credit on his love of country. On the 17th of May, at Carlisle, an agreement was concluded between Glencairn, Lennox, and Henry the Eighth, by which that monarch consented to settle an ample pension on the former, and his son the Master of Kilmaurs, whilst to Lennox a more splendid reward was promised in the government of Scotland, and the hand of Lady Margaret Douglas, his niece. Upon their side, the Scottish barons acknowledged Henry as Protector of the realm of Scotland,—a title which, considering his late invasion, almost sounds ironical; and they engaged to use their utmost efforts to become masters of the person of the young queen, and deliver her into his hands, along with the principal fortresses in the country. Lennox agreed to the surrender of Dumbarton, with the isle and castle of Bute. In conclusion, both earls stipulated that they would serve the English monarch against France, and all nations and persons, for such wages as his other subjects, no reservation being added of their allegiance to their natural prince, which, by the treaty, they virtually renounced.[2] In this base agreement one redeeming article was included, by which Glencairn and Lennox undertook to cause the word of God to be truly taught in their territories. The Bible is described by them as the only foundation from which all truth and honour proceedeth; but it appears not to have suggested itself to these Scottish barons, that the seizure of their lawful sovereign, and the betrayal of the liberty of their country, were scarcely reconcilable with the sacred standard to which they appealed.

From Carlisle, where he had concluded the negotiation, Glencairn hurried to his own country to assemble his vassals, whilst Lennox collected his strength at Dumbarton; but, as if to punish their desertion of their country, everything went against them. Arran, whose measures, now directed by the cardinal, were marked by unusual promptitude, lost not a moment in marching against them at the head of a thousand men, and advancing to Glasgow, was boldly confronted by Glencairn, with five hundred spearmen, on a wide common beside the city. The parties engaged under feelings of unusual obstinacy, and in the battle the unrelenting features of civil strife appeared with all their native ferocity; but Glencairn was at last defeated with great slaughter, his second son being slain, with many others of his party, while the rest were dispersed or made prisoners.[3] The governor immediately occupied the city, which he gave up to plunder, the chief magistrate having sided with

[1] Sadler, vol. i. p. 156.

[2] Rymer, Fœdera, vol. xv. pp. 23-26, inclusive; and pp. 29-32.

[3] Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, p. 32.

his adversary. Glencairn fled almost alone to Dumbarton, and Lennox, having delivered the castle into his hands, instantly took ship for England, where he was soon after united to the Lady Margaret Douglas. His favourable reception at the English court, and his unnatural conduct to his country, were fatal to his illustrious brother, the Lord Aubigny, in France, whom Francis the First, suspecting his fidelity, apparently on no good grounds, deprived of his high offices, and threw into prison.

Henry's affairs in Scotland, so far as they depended on the faction which had hitherto supported him, appeared at this crisis to be desperate; and a general council being summoned to meet at Stirling on the 3d of June,[1] it was attended by the whole body of the nobility, with the exception of Lennox and Glencairn. A favourable opportunity was now afforded for the union of all parties in support of the independence of the realm. The insincerity of Henry's professions was demonstrated by the cruel ravages with which his late invasion had been accompanied; a feeling of deep indignation had arisen in the breasts of many of his former adherents; and all classes recoiled from a union which they were called upon to celebrate amid the flames of their capital and the murder of its citizens. But it was the misfortune of the Scottish aristocracy, that when immediate danger was past, it was perpetually disunited by the spirit of selfishness and ambition. Of the nobles, a large majority had become disgusted with the weakness and vacillation of the government of Arran; and they now proposed that the regency should be conferred on the queen-mother, from whose energy they anticipated a happier result, and more determined measures against England.[2] It is probable that the Earl of Angus and his brother were chiefly implicated in this new movement, which is unknown to our general historians, and involved in much obscurity. It is certain, however, that a coalition took place between the Catholic and Protestant parties; that, in a convention, they declared the governor deprived of his authority, proclaimed the queen-dowager regent in his stead, appointed a new privy-council, and conferred upon the Earl of Angus the office of lieutenant-general of the kingdom.

This state of things could not long continue, and only brought increasing troubles to the country, which continued to be distracted by intestine dissensions and foreign war. Arran, still supported by the cardinal and a small party of the nobility, persevered in exercising his authority as governor, and the queen-dowager began to dread that all her endeavours would prove insufficient to keep her partisans together. In the Highlands and Isles the presence of Huntly and Argyle was required to repress a rebellion of the clans, encouraged, in all probability, by the intrigues of England, which frequently adopted this policy to weaken her enemy. The disturbance was speedily repressed, yet not without much bloodshed being mixed up with those private feuds which prevailed in these savage districts. In a ferocious contest at Inverlochy, between the Frasers, led by the Lord Lovat and his son, with a more numerous body of the Macdonalds, the combatants, stripping to their shirts on account of the extreme heat of the weather, fought rather for extermination than victory; two survivors being left on one side, and four on the other.[3] During these sanguinary con-

1 Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, p. 32.

2 Agreement of the principal Scots nobility to support the authority of the queen-mother as Regent of Scotland, against the Earl of Arran, declared by this instrument to be deprived of his office, dated June (no day) 1544. State-paper Office, (see also Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, p. 33.) The agreement is not an original paper, but an authentic copy; transmitted, probably, by some of the spies in Henry's interest at the Scottish court. It is signed by the Earls of Angus, Bothwell, Montrose, Lord Sinclair, Robert Maxwell, Earl of Huntly, Cassillis, Marshal, Lord Somerville, George Douglas, Earl of Moray, Argyle, Errol, Lords Erskine, St John, Malcolm, lord chamberlain, Hew, lord Lovat, and Sir John Campbell of Cawdor, knight.

3 Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, p. 34.

tests in the remote Highlands, an equally disgraceful spectacle was exhibited at Perth, where a claim for the office of provost was decided by arms, between Lord Ruthven on the one side, supported by a numerous train of his vassals, and Lord Gray, with Norman Lesley, master of Rothes, and Charteris of Kinfauns, on the other. During his late ecclesiastical progress to Perth, the cardinal, who suspected Ruthven of leaning to the reformed opinions, had deprived him of his office of provost, and directed the citizens to elect Charteris: a crafty device, as was believed, to sow dissension between his rivals in power, it being notorious that the Lords Gray and Ruthven, with the Earl of Rothes and his adherents, had been hitherto unanimous in their opposition to Beaton. Nor was he unsuccessful: Ruthven, supported by the townsmen and merchants, in those days trained to arms, resented the affront, and held his place by force, whilst Charteris, reinforced by Gray, Glammis, and Norman Lesley, broke into the town; and both parties meeting on the narrow bridge over the Tay, fought with sanguinary obstinacy till the victory declared for Ruthven; sixty of his opponents being left dead on the pavement, and the rest compelled to fly from the city.[1]

It was now time for the Earl of Lennox to perform his engagements to Henry; and having sailed from Bristol with a squadron of ten ships, and a small force of hagbutteers, archers, and pikemen, he arrived on the coast of Scotland, attacked and plundered the isle of Arran, and sailing to Bute, occupied the island and its castle of Rothesay with little difficulty. These acquisitions, according to agreement, were delivered to Sir Rise Mansell and Richard Broke, who accompanied the expedition, and took formal possession of them in behalf of the King of England.[2] He next directed his course to Dumbarton castle, a fortress of which, as the key of the west of Scotland, Henry had long, but in vain, sought the possession. It was the property of Lennox, and being commanded by Stirling of Glorat, one of his retainers, to whom he had intrusted it on his departure for England, he did not doubt for a moment that it would be surrendered. In this, however, he was disappointed: Stirling received and recognised him as his master, but the brave baron did not forget his higher allegiance to his sovereign. The first mention of his giving up the castle to Henry was received with a burst of generous indignation; the garrison taking the alarm, rose in arms; and Lennox, with his English friends, becoming alarmed for their safety, were glad to make a precipitate retreat to their ships.

In the meantime the Earl of Argyle, with a considerable force, had occupied Dunoon, a strong castle situated on the narrow strait between Argyle and Renfrew, whilst George Douglas, with four thousand men, had entered Dumbarton. The squadron therefore deemed it prudent to fall down the Clyde; and being fired on in passing Dunoon, Lennox, in the chivalrous spirit of the times, accepted the defiance, and landing under cover of a fire from his own ships, attacked the Highlanders, whom he dispersed with considerable slaughter. He next invaded Cantire, plundered the adjacent coasts of Kyle and Carrick, and returning to Bristol, despatched Sir Peter Mewtas to inform King Henry, then at Boulogne, of the termination of an expedition which had failed in its principal purpose—the seizure of Dumbarton; and only rendered more distant the prospect of peace between the countries.[3] Much indignation was expressed by Lennox and the English ministers against the Earl of Glencairn and his son, the Master of Kil-

[1] Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, p. 34.

[2] Instructions to Sir Rise Mansell and Richard Broke. State-paper Office, August 1544. In the same repository is a Letter from Lennox to the Privy-Council, dated West Chester, 8th of August 1544. He was then going by land to Beaumaris, to join his ship, which had sailed the day before, and intended to proceed with all diligence on his expedition.

[3] We know from the Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, p. 35, that Lennox arrived at Dumbarton on the 10th of August.

maurs, whose services had been so lately purchased, and so soon withdrawn. Wriothesley, the chancellor, inveighed against "the old fox and his cub," who had imposed on the simplicity of Lennox; and although both the father and son had written to excuse their proceedings, their falsehood was considered apparent, and their apology little regarded.[1]

During the continuance of this expedition, Sir Ralph Eure, Sir Brian Layton, and Sir Richard Bowes ravaged the Scottish Borders with merciless barbarity, and organising a system of rapine and devastation against those districts where the Scots were most defenceless, reduced the country almost to a desert.[2] It could scarcely indeed be otherwise, considering the perseverance of the Border inroads, and the distracted state of public affairs produced by the continued dissensions between the parties of the governor and the queen-dowager. Men neither knew whom to obey, nor where to look for protection. In the beginning of November the regent held a parliament, in which Angus and his brother were charged with treason, and all the heavy feudal penalties of banishment and forfeiture threatened to be enforced against them. On the 13th of the same month the three estates assembled at Stirling in obedience to the summons of the queen, who at the same time issued a proclamation discharging all classes of the people from their allegiance to the pretended regent.[3] In this state of things, the talents of the cardinal were again employed in negotiating an agreement between the rival factions, which, although insincere, had a brief success. Peace seemed to be restored, and Arran, eager to avenge the late outrages, advanced at the head of seven thousand men to the Borders, and laid siege to Coldingham, then held by the enemy. But scarce had they planted their artillery, when their proceedings became again weakened by suspicion and treason. It was discovered that the Douglases continued their correspondence with England; the inferior leaders, dreading the result, began to disperse in disorder; the governor became alarmed for his personal safety, and two thousand English defeated and chased off the field a Scottish army more than triple their number. In this disgraceful rout, Angus, who had the conduct of the vanguard with Glencairn, Cassillis, Lord Somerville, and the sheriff of Ayr, opposed no resistance to the enemy; whilst Bothwell, who brought up the rear, in vain attempted to rally, and was at last compelled to join in the flight.[4]

The failure of this last expedition was wholly to be ascribed to the intrigues of the Douglases, who, with their associates, Glencairn and Cassillis, were now playing a desperate game. A sentence of treason hung over their heads in Scotland; in England, Henry regarded their conduct with so much suspicion, that in the late expedition of Hertford no protection had been granted to their estates and vassals. They were now, therefore, in a position as precarious as it was discreditable; likely to lose the confidence of both governments; exposed to the chance of banishment from their own country, and to be cut

[1] State-papers of Henry the Eighth, published by Government, p. 769.

[2] Of these inroads, a brief contemporary abstract has been preserved in Haynes's State-papers, (pp. 43-55 inclusive,) a bloody ledger, as it has been rightly denominated, which, with all the formality of a business account, contains the successive inroads, burnings, and spoliations from July till November. By this it appears that of towns, by which we must understand small villages, towers, farm offices, parish churches, and fortified dwelling-houses, were burnt 192; and that the plunder amounted, in cattle, to 10,386; in sheep, to 12,492; in nags, geldings, and foals, to 1496; whilst the small number of those slain or made prisoners, evinces the little resistance encountered, and the defenceless state of the country.

[3] Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, p. 36; corroborated in its dates by the Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, vol. ii. pp. 445-447. It is worthy of notice that these rival parliaments, which are new to Scottish history, are alone mentioned in the Diurnal of Occurrents.

[4] The cannon, however, were carried off, as is asserted, by the exertions of the Douglases. Their general conduct in the expedition renders the fact extremely doubtful.

off from a retreat into England. Under these circumstances they adopted that middle course which is not uncommon to men long engaged in political intrigue; and, more studious for the possession of power, than the preservation of character, they determined to break wholly with neither party. George Douglas, brother of Angus, a man of great ability, and little scrupulous as to means, continued his correspondence with the English king, and betrayed to him the secrets of the government. Angus, on the other hand, deceived Arran and the queen-dowager into the belief that they had completely repented of their former tergiversation, and convinced of the injustice of Henry's demands, were prepared cordially to co-operate in the defence of the country.[1]

By this pretended coalition they gained an important end. In a parliament held at Edinburgh in the beginning of December, which was attended by the whole body of the nobility, the earl and his brother, Sir George, being personally present, were absolved from the charge of treason, and declared innocent of the crimes which had been alleged against them. Glencairn, Cassillis, and Sir Hugh Campbell, sheriff of Ayr, obtained at the same time a remission for all treasons committed by them, in return for the good service done, or to be done, to the realm, although it does not clearly appear what services could be meant.[2] An attempt was made to raise, by a land tax, a sum of money for the support of a thousand horsemen, to be placed for the defence of the Borders under the Earl of Angus, which completely failed. The barons of Lothian declined either to pay the money, or to serve under a leader whose honesty they doubted; and so universal was the suspicion of the treachery of the Douglases, that when the regent repaired to Lauder, and issued his command for the immediate muster of the whole force of the realm, the country, throughout its various districts, refused to rise in arms. The commons dreaded a repetition of the flight from Coldingham, and the barons adopted the expedient of entering into covenants with each other for their mutual defence against the continued inroads of the English.[3]

Of all this the effects were deplorable. During the contest for the regency, the Border barons, whose duty it was to defend these districts, remained inactive; many Border clans, at all times somewhat precarious in their allegiance, entered into the service of England, and assumed the red cross as a badge of their desertion; others were compelled to purchase protection; whilst the English wardens insulted over the country, and became so confident in their superiority, that they contemplated its entire conquest even to the Forth as a matter of no difficult attainment.

With these proud hopes, Sir Ralph Eure and Sir Brian Layton repaired to court; and in an interview with the king, explained to him a scheme for this purpose, which, as a means of punishing the alleged perfidy of the Scots, met with his entire approval. As a reward for the uninterrupted success with which their various inroads had been attended, Eure obtained, it is said, a royal grant of all the country he should conquer in the Merse, Teviotdale, and Lauderdale, districts of which a great part formed the hereditary property of the Earls of Douglas. The insolence of so premature an appropriation of his paternal estates incensed Angus far more than the indignity offered to his country; and he is said to have sworn a great oath, that if Ralph Eure dared to act upon the grant, he would write his sasine, or instrument of possession, on his skin with sharp pens and bloody ink. The English baron, however,

[1] Our general historians, Buchanan, Lesley, and Maitland, not aware of the double part acted by the Douglases, have represented this coalition as sincere. Not so, however, the Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 38, which gives the only accurate account of the siege of Coldingham and the dispersion of the army. As to Buchanan, his narrative on this part of our history is so completely at variance with the truth, that it is little else than a classical romance.

[2] Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, p. 36.

[3] Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, p. 37.

was not of a temper to be deterred by threats, and soon after repaired to the Borders with a force of five thousand men, consisting of foreign mercenaries, English archers, and a body of six hundred Border Scots, who wore the red cross above their armour. With these they had recommenced their inroads, in which they even exceeded their former barbarity. They burnt the tower of Broomhouse, and in it its lady, a noble and aged matron, with her whole family. They penetrated to Melrose, which they left completely spoiled and in ruins, not sparing its venerable abbey, the burial-place of the Earls of Douglas, whose tombs they ransacked and defaced with wanton sacrilege.

Deeply enraged at this new insult, Angus collected his vassals, and joining the governor, advanced to Melrose; but they were surprised by a sudden attack of the English, and driven from their position with considerable slaughter. The cause of this new disaster is ascribed by an ancient chronicle, apparently a contemporary document, to the secret information furnished to the enemy by George Douglas; and it is certain that he was then in communication both with Sir Ralph Eure and his royal master; but the sincerity of his brother the earl upon this occasion is not to be doubted. He acted in the true spirit of a feudal baron. The love of revenge, the desire to retaliate the insult offered to his house, burned inextinguishably strong in a bosom which, for many years, had been a stranger to the love of his country; and Douglas, true only to himself, appeared for the moment to be true to Scotland. With these bitter feelings he saw the English once more plunder Melrose, and commence their retreat to Jedburgh; whilst he and Arran with a far inferior force, could only hang upon their rear and watch their motions.

On reaching the Teviot, Eure, confident in his superior strength, which was more than five to one, encamped on a level moor or common above the village of Ancrum; whilst the Scots fell back to a neighbouring eminence, and hesitated whether, with so great a disparity, they should risk a battle. At this moment they were joined by Norman Lesley, master of Rothes, at the head of twelve hundred lances; and soon after, Walter Scott, the veteran Laird of Buccleuch, came up at full speed, with the news that his followers were within an hour's march.[1] It was resolved, with these reinforcements, to give battle to the enemy, who, during all this time, eagerly watched their motions; but, by the advice of Buccleuch, Arran abandoned the height which he occupied, and drew up in a level plain behind it, named Peniel Heugh, where they were entirely concealed from the English. They then dismounted and sent the horses with the camp boys to an eminence beyond the plain. These dispositions were intended to betray the English into the idea that the Scottish army was in flight; and they succeeded. Rendered careless and confident by their long career of success, and anticipating a repetition of the combat at Coldingham, Sir Brian Layton and Sir Robert Bowes pushed on with the advance; whilst Sir Ralph Eure followed at full speed with the main battle, consisting of a thousand spears, with an equal number of archers and hagbutteers on each wing. The rapidity of their movement necessarily threw their ranks into some disorder; the horses were blown by their gallop up the hill; the infantry were breathless from eagerness to arrive on the same ground with their companions; and in this state, having surmounted the eminence, they discovered, to their astonishment, instead of an enemy in flight, the compact serried phalanx of the Scots within a short distance of their own army. At this moment a heron, disturbed by the troops, sprang from the adjacent marsh, and soared away over the heads of the combatants. "Oh!" said Angus, "that I had here my white goss-hawk: we should then all 'yoke'[2] at once." To have halted, with the

[1] Maitland, vol. ii. p. 861.

[2] To yoke—to set to; buckling closely together.

hope of restoring order to their ranks, would have been fatal; and Eure, relying on his superiority, charged bravely and without delay. But the advantage of infantry over cavalry, of which the main body of the English was composed, never more strikingly evinced itself. The Scottish spears, an ell longer than the English, repulsed the van under Layton and Bowes, and pushed it back in confusion on the main battle, which, in its turn, was thrown upon the rearward. All was soon in confusion, and no efforts of their gallant leaders could prevent an entire rout. The setting sun shone full in the faces of the English; and their enemy had also the advantage of the wind, which blew the smoke of the harquebusses upon the columns of their adversaries and blinded them. On the first symptoms of flight, the six hundred Scottish Borderers, who were in the service of Henry, throwing away their red crosses, joined their countrymen, and with the merciless spirit common to renegades, made a pitiless slaughter of their former friends. The neighbouring peasantry, who, from terror of the English, had not engaged in the battle, rose upon the flying enemy; and such was the deep desire of vengeance produced by the late ravages, that even the women took part in the pursuit, and calling out to their husbands and relatives to "remember Broomhouse," encouraged them in the work of retribution. On the English side the loss was great, eight hundred being slain, and a thousand made prisoners; but that which afforded most satisfaction to the enemy was the discovery, amongst the dead bodies, of Eure and Layton, the leaders who, for the last six months, had signalised themselves by such unexampled and cruel ravages. Amongst the captives were many knights and gentlemen; and the governor, having first seized the camp equipage which was left in Melrose, advanced to Coldingham, which the enemy evacuated. He then marched to Jedburgh, and recovered from the English, not only the town, but the greater part of the Borders, which they had lately considered a conquered territory, making proclamation that all who had been compelled to accept assurance from England, and assume the red cross, should, on returning to their allegiance, have a full indemnity.

On receiving news of this defeat, Henry expressed deep indignation against Angus, whom he accused of ingratitude, and threatened with the extremity of his resentment. Douglas's answer was characteristic:—"What," said he, "is our brother-in-law offended, because, like a good Scotsman, I have avenged upon Ralph Eure the defaced tombs of my ancestors? They were better men than he, and I ought to have done no less; and will he take my life for that? Little knows King Henry the skirts of Kernetable; I can keep myself there against all his English host."[1]

By this success confidence was restored to the people, whose hearts had sunk under the unresisted ravages of the English; whilst new strength was given to the party of the governor and the cardinal. It happened also that, at this moment, they confidently expected the support of their continental allies. Francis the First, irritated by the late invasion of Henry and the loss of Boulogne, was resolved to exert his utmost efforts against England. He had detached the emperor from his alliance with that country, and now made preparations for its invasion by a powerful fleet; whilst he determined to send an auxiliary force into Scotland to make a diversion in that quarter.

Of such resolutions early advice was sent from France to Arran; and the English monarch, having become acquainted with these hostile intentions by a secret despatch from George Douglas, began seriously to dread the con-

[1] Godscroft's History of the House and Race of Douglas, vol. ii. p. 123. As a biographer, Hume of Godscroft not unfrequently gives us characteristic traits, which I borrow from his pages when they bear the marks of truth. As an authentic historian, no one who has compared his rambling eulogistic story with contemporary documents, will venture to quote him.

sequences of raising so many enemies against him, and to be convinced that his conduct towards Scotland had been inconsistent and impolitic. He was assured by Douglas, that so far from gaining his object, or promoting the treaties of peace and marriage, the rigorous measures which some reported he intended to use, would drive the people to despair.[1] These remonstrances produced some effect; Henry prevailed on himself to try conciliation, and intrusted the Earl of Cassillis, one of his Solway prisoners, who had been long attached to the interests of England, with the management of the negotiation. This nobleman repaired to the English court, February 28th, 1545; and having received his instructions, returned, after a short absence, to Scotland. To prevail upon the Earls of Glencairn, Marshal, and the Douglases, who professed never to have left the allegiance to the English king, to renew their active efforts in his service, was no difficult task; and the Earl of Angus, as a proof of his sincerity, resigned his office of lieutenant under Arran; but the governor and the cardinal were more difficult to manage. Huntly, Argyle, and the queen-dowager were absent. It was necessary they should be first consulted; and a convention of the nobility was appointed to be held on the 15th of April, for the purpose of deliberating on Henry's offers, and giving his envoy a final answer. In the meantime the wardens were commanded to abstain from all hostilities; whilst, by the advice of Cassillis, the English monarch prepared his force for the invasion of the country, should matters not proceed according to his expectation. An army of thirty thousand men, under the command of the Earl of Hertford, was directed to be levied on the Borders; and Sir Ralph Sadler, whose acquaintance with Scotland had well fitted him for the office, was appointed treasurer-at-war and political agent.[2]

On the 17th of April the convention was held at Edinburgh; Cassillis presented himself as the envoy of Henry, and acquainted the nobles that, if they consented to the treaties of peace and marriage, he was empowered to assure them that the king would forget what had passed, and forbear to avenge the injuries which he had received.[3] It was the infirmity of this prince that, even in his efforts at conciliation, he assumed a tone of pride and superiority which defeated his object. The injuries which he had received were little in comparison with those which he had recently inflicted, and his power of avenging them was at best problematical. The influence too of the party of the governor and the cardinal was every day increasing; certain intelligence of the embarkation of the auxiliaries had been received from France; from Denmark they expected a fleet of merchantmen laden with provisions; a friendly negotiation had been opened with the emperor; and new importance had been conferred on Beaton by his receiving from Rome the dignity of legate *a latere* in Scotland.[4] All these circumstances gave confidence to the political friends of the cardinal; whilst Henry's late invasion and subsequent inroads had created distrust and aversion, even in many of his former supporters. The consequence of this was natural—almost inevitable; the negotiation of Cassillis entirely failed; the influence of Beaton carried everything before it in the convention; the treaties of peace and marriage were declared at an end; and it was resolved cordial-

[1] Original Letter, Sir George Douglas to the King, from Lauder, February 25, 1544–5. Douglas asks Henry's pardon if he had offended him, states his great losses by the last invasion of the English army, and assures him that the rigorous measures which it was reported he intended to use towards Scotland would be the means of driving the people to desperation. State-paper Office.

[2] Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, p. 38.

[3] Letter from the Privy-Council to the Earl of Cassillis, in answer to his letter in cipher of 2d April,—communicating the king's directions, April 10, 1545. State-paper Office.

[4] Letter, Lord-Lieutenant and Council of the North to the King, May 1, 1545,—stating that a Hull vessel had captured a Dutch ship laden with provisions for the Scots; and that in one of the chests was found a commission from the Pope, appointing Beaton legate *a latere* in Scotland.

ly to embrace the assistance of France.[1] The earl instantly informed Henry of the complete defeat of his negotiation; and, in the letter which conveyed the intelligence, advised the immediate invasion of Scotland with a strong force.

Mortified to be thus repulsed, Henry's animosity against Beaton became more vehement than before. To his energy and political talent he justly ascribed his defeat; and whilst he urged his preparations for war, he encouraged the Earl of Cassillis in organising a conspiracy for his assassination. The plot is entirely unknown either to our Scottish or English historians; and now, after the lapse of nearly three centuries, has been discovered in the secret correspondence of the State-paper Office. It appears that Cassillis had addressed a letter to Sadler, in which he made an offer "for the killing of the cardinal, if his majesty would have it done, and promise when it was done, a reward." Sadler shewed the letter to the Earl of Hertford and the Council of the North, and by them it was transmitted to the king.[2] Cassillis's associates, to whom he had communicated his purpose, were the Earls of Angus, Glencairn, Marshal, and Sir George Douglas; and these persons requested that Forster, an English prisoner of some note, who could visit Scotland without suspicion, should be sent to Edinburgh to communicate with them on the design for cutting off Beaton. Hertford accordingly consulted the privy-council upon his majesty's wishes in this affair, requiring to be informed whether Cassillis's plan for the assassination of his powerful enemy was agreeable to the king, and whether Forster should be despatched into Scotland. Henry, conveying his wishes through the privy-council, replied that he desired Forster to set off immediately; to the other part of the query, touching the assassination of the cardinal, the answer of the privy-council was in these words:—"His majesty hath willed us to signify unto your lordship that his highness, reputing the fact not meet to be set forward expressly by his majesty, will not seem to have to do in it, and yet not misliking the offer, thinketh good that Mr Sadler, to whom that letter was addressed, should write to the earl of the receipt of his letter containing such an offer, which he thinketh not convenient to be communicated to the king's majesty. Marry, to write to him what he thinketh of the matter; he shall say that if he were in the Earl of Cassillis's place, and were as able to do his majesty good service there as he knoweth him to be, and thinketh a right good will in him to do it, he would surely do what he could for the execution of it, believing verily to do thereby not only an acceptable service to the king's majesty, but also a special benefit to the realm of Scotland, and would trust verily the king's majesty would consider his service in the same; as you doubt not of his accustomed goodness to those which serve him, but he would do the same to him."[3] In this reply there was some address; Henry preserved, as he imagined, his regal dignity; and whilst he affected ignorance of the atrocious design, encouraged its execution, and shifted the whole responsibility upon his obsequious agents. On both points the king's commands were obeyed; Sadler wrote to Cassillis in the indirect manner which had been pointed out; and Forster, in compliance with the wishes of the conspirators, was sent into Scotland, and had an interview with Angus, Cassillis, and

[1] Letter in cipher, with the original decipher, Cassillis to Henry the Eighth, April 20, 1545. State-paper Office.

[2] Privy-Council to the Earl of Hertford, dated Greenwich, May 30, 1545,—relative to the proposition of the Earl of Cassillis, for the assassination of Cardinal Beaton. MS. State-paper Office. Also, letter from the Council of the North to the King's Majesty, May 21, 1545. MS. State-paper Office. By the letter of 30th May, quoted above, it appears that the first resolution of the associated earls was to send a confidential envoy to meet and communicate with Sir Ralph Sadler at Alnwick. As to this purpose, however, they changed their mind, probably from the fear of incurring suspicion, and requested that Forster should be sent.

[3] Lords of the Privy-Council to Hertford, May 30, 1545. State-paper Office.

Sir George Douglas; the substance of which he has given in an interesting report which is still preserved.[1] It is evident, from this paper, that both Angus and Cassillis were deterred from committing themselves on such delicate ground as the proposed murder of the cardinal, by the cautious nature of Sadler's letter to Cassillis, who, in obedience to the royal orders, had recommended the assassination of the prelate, as if from himself; and had affirmed, though falsely, that he had not communicated the project to the king. These two earls, therefore, said not a word to the envoy on the subject; although Cassillis on his departure intrusted him with a letter in cipher for Sadler. Sir George Douglas, however, was less timorous, and sent by Forster a message to the Earl of Hertford in very explicit terms:—"He willed me," says the envoy, "to tell my lord-lieutenant, that if the king would have the cardinal dead; if his grace would promise a good reward for the doing thereof, so that the reward were known what it should be, the country being lawless as it is, he thinketh that that adventure would be proved; for he saith, the common saying is, the cardinal is the only occasion of the war, and is smally beloved in Scotland; and then, if he were dead, by that means how that reward should be paid." Such was the simple proposal of Sir George Douglas for the removal of his arch-enemy; but, although the English king had no objection to give the utmost secret encouragement to the conspiracy, he hesitated to offer such an outrage to the common feelings of Christendom, as to set a price upon the head of the cardinal, and to offer a reward and indemnity to those who should slay him. For the moment, therefore, the scheme seemed to be abandoned by the earls, but it was only to be afterwards resumed by Brunston.[2]

In the midst of these machinations for the removal of his enemies, and preparations for open war, important events had taken place in Scotland. Early in May a French fleet, having on board a body of three thousand in-

1 The Discourse of Thomas Forster, gentleman, being sent into Scotland by my Lord-lieutenant, to speak to the Earls of Cassillis, Glencairn, Angus, Marshal, and George Douglas, being returned with the same to Darnton the 4th July 1545. MS. State-paper Office.

2 In the light which it throws upon the intrigues of the Douglases and the state of parties in Scotland, the report of Forster is a paper of great historical value. It will be published in its entire state in the forthcoming volume of the State Papers; but an analysis of it, with a few brief extracts, may be interesting to the reader. It thus opens:—"The said Thomas Forster sayth, that according to my Lord-lieutenant's commandment, he entered Scotland at Wark, and so passed to his taker's house in Scotland, as tho he had repayred for his entree to save his lande, and declaring to his taker that he had occasion to speke with George Douglas, his taker was contented, according to the custome there, that he shuld go at his pleasure; whereupon he came to Dalkeith to George Douglas, and shewed him th' occasion of his hither comyng to speak to him and th' Erll aforesaid, with message from my Lord-lieutenant and Master Sadleyr, who willed him to go to Douglas, where he would cause th' Erlls of Cassillis and Anguisse to mete hym, for he said he could not get them to Dalkeith without gret suspition. And hereupon, he sayth, that going towards Douglas he met th' Erll of Anguisse at Dumfries, where, as he was hunting, he gave him welcome, saying he would give him hawkes and dogges, and caused him to pass the time with him that night; and on the morrowe brought hym with him to Douglas, and that afternoon sent for th' Erll of Cassillis, who, ryding all night, came thither the next day yerly in the mornyng, whereupon he and th' Erll of Anguisse went into a chamber together, and called the said Forster unto them, who then declared the occasion of his comyng, by whom he was sent, and the full of his instructions. As to the first article, they answered that they were glad he was come, and was welcome to them." To the second article, they say they indeed wanted Forster to come; and in reply to the question, how Henry's godly purpose for the peace and marriage may best be furthered, Cassillis answers that he is still the same true man to Henry as he was at his parting with his majesty. Angus equally promised his cordial assistance, and declared he would either *go to the field or stay at home, as Henry judged it best*, and would maintain, in the face of all Scotland, that the peace and the marriage were for the good of the realme of Scotland. Forster then desired them to state to him such matters as they had intended to communicate by the gentleman that should have met Mr Sadler at Alnwick; upon which they briefly answered, that "the effect of that matter was none other than they had already declared;" but Cassillis added, "that such other matters as should be at the *convencion he would write it in cipher*, and send it to Mr Sadleyr," and so departed from them; and returning again to Dalkeith

fantry and five hundred horse, under the command of the Sieur Lorges de Montgomerie, arrived off the west coast; but recollecting the device lately practised on their countrymen by the Earl of Lennox, this experienced officer was cautious of committing himself by landing till informed of the exact state of the country. Being assured, however, that the French politics were still predominant, they disembarked at Dumbarton, and were received with much distinction; nor did the enthusiasm diminish when it was found they had brought a considerable sum of money for the emergencies of the war, a bodyguard of a hundred archers to wait on the governor's person, and the insignia of the Order of St Michael for Angus.[1] This favourable news the cardinal did not fail immediately to disseminate among his partisans; and a convention of the nobility being soon after held at Stirling, it was resolved that the league with France should be maintained, and hostilities immediately commenced against England, but with a great portion of the nobility these declarations were insincere. At this very moment Cassillis was organising his conspiracy for cutting off the cardinal; whilst his associates, Angus, Glencairn, and Sir George Douglas, had assured Forster, the English envoy, of their entire devotedness to his master. When the governor, therefore, assembled the Scottish host on the 9th of August, it was strong in apparent numbers, but weakened by treason and suspicion. From a force of thirty thousand men, with the veteran infantry of France, and a fine body of cavalry, including eighty barbed horse, something important was expected; and the people, whose feelings were strongly excited against England, looked with eager anxiety to the result. But they were miserably disappointed. The vanguard of the army was commanded by Angus; under him were the lords in the English interest, with the minor barons who followed them; and their indisposition to hostilities completely shackled the efforts of the remainder of the army. England was indeed invaded, but the operations were feeble and disunited. Hertford had made excellent dispositions for the defence of the Borders by his foreign mercenaries; the Spanish and Italian troops repelled the Scots with great gallantry; the preparations of many months led only to the sack of a few

unto George Douglas, he said he declared to the said George all his conference with the foresaid Erls, requiring him to shew him his opinion therein. Douglas promises to do so after the convention. Forster goes on to state that Douglas went then to the convention, where he tarried seven days. On the return of Douglas from this convention, Forster asked the news, and what he would do for the king's Majesty's advancement and godly affairs? Douglas answers, "that he will stand to it in all his power," the rather that he himself was one of them that "procured and promised the same, and that ther was never an honest man in Scotland that would be against that promise, for it was the doinge of all the nobles of Scotland, and the Governor's part was therein as deep as the rest of them."—Another thing agreed on at the convention was, that "they would raise an army against the xxviiith of July, and to have them upon Roslin Moor, three miles from Dalkeith, with a month's victuall, and so passing to invade England; by which tyme he saith the said Lorges Montgomerie hath undertaken on the French king's behalf, that th' army out of France by sea shall be ready to ayde them at their handes, or els at that time should invade in some other place of England. The said George Douglas told him also, that if my Lord-lieutenant thought mete th' army of Scotland were stayed, that then it should be well done to send some ships with diligence with three or four thousand men to ayde the gentlemen of the Isles, which would stay at home th' Erlls of Huntly and Argyle, and by that meanes he thinks it would stop the rest of th' army from coming forward; and if it is not so, then to prepare a great power of England to come to the Borders against that time, which must come very strongly, for all the Lords and power of Scotland, as he sayth, will be wholly there, as they have promised: and by reason of th' encouragement of the Frenchmen and the fair largesses, that the French king hath promised them by Lorges Montgomerie, they are fully bent to fight as he sayth. But he saith, tho' that he must needs be also there with them, he will do them no good, but will do all that he can to stop them; and sayth, that if they may be stopped since they have made so gret braggis and avant to Lorges Montgomerie, it wold, as he thinketh, put away all the Commons' hearts from them." *

* The old spelling is not uniformly followed in the copy of this note.

[1] Intelligence by the Lord Wharton's espiels, sent to the Earl of Hertford, June 11, 1545. State-paper Office.

obscure villages and the capture of some Border strengths; and after two days, the army of Scotland returned, to use the words of an ancient and authentic chronicle, "through the deceit of George Douglas and the vanguard."[1]

It was on the 13th of August that this disastrous retreat took place, and three days after, the Scottish lords in the interest of England addressed from Melrose a letter to Henry, in which they claimed credit for the total failure of the invasion, and advised the immediate advance of the Earl of Hertford, with an overwhelming force, into the heart of the country, so well provided as to remain there for a lengthened period. They recommended him, at the same time, to march during the present harvest, and to publish a proclamation, declaring that he came not to hurt the realm or any subject in it who would assist in promoting the peace and marriage between the two countries. The letter is a remarkable one, and affords a melancholy proof of the true character of the men who, by our historians, are imagined to have at that moment entirely deserted the service of England.[2]

The Earl of Hertford was sufficiently eager to obey these instructions, although to support a main army for any long period, and to follow the course pointed out by the Anglo-Scottish faction, required greater resources than Henry could command, and was not agreeable to the impetuous spirit of the monarch. Preparations had been already made for the intended invasion, not only by land, but for a naval descent on the west coast. Negotiations were opened, through the Earl of Lennox, with Donald, lord of the Isles and earl of Ross; and this petty prince, with eighteen of his barons, disclaiming in proud language all allegiance to Scotland, of which realm he described himself and his progenitors as the "auld enemies," entered willingly into the service of the English monarch, and bound themselves to assist Lennox with a force of eight thousand men.[3] Henry, who had been instructed by Glencairn and Douglas in the important policy of keeping Argyle and Huntly in their own country by a diversion in the Isles, warmly welcomed the offers of the ocean prince, appointed him an annual pension, and encouraged him to assemble his forces. On the 18th of August, only a few days after the retreat of the governor, the Lord of the Isles passed over to Knockfergus in Ireland, with a fleet of a hundred and eighty galleys, and having on board a force of

1 Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 40.

2 State-paper Office, Letter, Hertford, Bishop of Durham, and Sir R. Sadler to the king, enclosing the letter from the Scottish earls, Aug. 25, 1545. The passage explaining the cause of the failure of the last invasion is curious, and completely corroborates the statement of the Diurnal of Occurrents quoted in the text, which statement is not to be found in any of our Scottish historians. "Further as to this last journey of ours, it was advised by the queen, cardinal, and this French captain, Lorges Montgomerie. Huntly fortified this armye at his power; notwithstanding, all that they devised was stopped by us that are the king's friends." If the reader will take the trouble to turn to Maitland, vol. ii. pp. 861, 862; or Lesley, pp. 456, 457; or Ridpath's Border History, p. 552; or Buchanan, book xv. c. 28, he will discover how much the history of this important period has been mistaken and perverted. It was, perhaps, the discrepancy between the Diurnal of Occurrents and these writers which misled its editor into the idea that its first portion was composed from tradition and other imperfect sources. Yet it is the Diurnal which is right whilst they are in the wrong.

3 Original Commission, 28th July 1545, apud Ellencarne, from Donald, lord of the Isles, and the Barons and Council of the Isles, to Rory Macalister, bishop elect of the Isles, and Patrick Maclane, to enter into a treaty with Matthew, earl of Lennox. The document (State-paper Office) is a diplomatic curiosity; not one of the Highland chieftains, eighteen in number, being able to write his name. To the Celtic antiquary and genealogist, whose feet do not usually rest on such certain ground, it may be interesting to give the names. They are, Hector Maclane, lord of Doward; Johne Macallister, capitane of Clanranald; Rorye Macleod of Lewis; Alexander Macleod of Dumbeggane; Murdoch Maclane of Lochbuy; Angus Maconnill, brudir germane to James Maconnill; Alane Maclane of Turloske, bruder germane to the Lord Maclane; Archibald Maconnill, capitane of Clan Houston; Alexander Mackeyn of Ardnamurchane; Jhone Maclane of Coll; Gilliganan Macneill of Barray; Ewin Macinnon of Straguhordill; Jhone Macquorre of Ulway; Thom Maclane of Ardgour; Alexander Ranaldsoun of Glengarrie; Angus Ranaldsoun of Knwdort; Donald Maclane of Kengarrloch.

four thousand men. They are described in the original despatch from the Irish Privy-council, giving Henry notice of their arrival, as "very tall men, clothed for the most part in habergeons of mail, armed with long swords and long bows, but with few guns."[1] To co-operate with the Islesmen, Henry commanded the Earl of Ormond to raise a body of two thousand kerns and galloglasses, and appointed the Earl of Lennox to the chief command in the expedition; but at this moment Hertford, now ready to invade Scotland, requested the presence of the Scottish earl in his camp, and the western invasion was postponed till the termination of the campaign.[2]

On the 5th of September the English commander assembled his army, and having previously sent word to Cassillis, Glencairn, and the two Douglases, that he expected they would join him with their vassals, he advanced to Alnwick, from which, rapidly pushing through Northumberland, he crossed the Border, and encamped before Kelso. The town, which was an open one, he occupied with ease; but the abbey held out, and the Spanish mercenaries who assaulted it were repulsed by the garrison, composed partly of monks. Hertford, however, brought up his ordnance, and a breach being effected, the church was carried, the steeple stormed, and its defenders put to the sword. In the meantime his friends, the Scottish earls, evaded his proposal of joining the army, and informed him by a secret messenger, who brought a letter in cipher, that they could not without danger assemble their forces till acquainted more minutely with his plans.[3] No line of conduct could have been adopted more discreditable to themselves or more unhappy in its consequences to the people. Had they been bold and consistent in their adherence to England, their extensive estates would have been exempted from plunder, and the peasantry would have escaped through the desertion of their lords; but their present conduct, whilst it brought all the evils, shared in none of the advantages of treachery, and only provoked Hertford to a more cruel and sanguinary retaliation. The lands of the potent house of Douglas lay principally in the districts now invaded. Melrose and Dryburgh were successively given to the flames; the villages, castles, and farm-granges of the adjacent country razed and plundered; and the miserable inhabitants suffered the utmost extremities of war, of which it would be painful to recapitulate the common tale of havoc and desolation. Jedburgh was burnt, and fourteen villages in the neighbourhood. Hertford, in a despatch to Henry, exultingly informed him it was the opinion of the Border gentlemen so much damage had not been done in Scotland by fire for the last hundred years. Nay, so excessive was the cruelty, that it shocked even the English Borderers; and as they evinced a disposition to be lenient, an advanced guard of a hundred Irish was appointed to burn and spoil the villages in a more complete manner.[4]

During these disgusting scenes the Scots were inactive. The experience of the last invasion had convinced the governor and the cardinal that Angus and his associates were more likely to betray than defend the country. Huntly and Argyle, dreading the meditated attack of Lennox and the Lord of the Isles on the west coast, were detained in their own country, and after one abortive attempt to promote union and resume hostilities, Arran appears to have abandoned the task in despair. Ten thousand men, who were with difficulty assembled, entered

[1] Letter, Irish Correspondence, State-paper Office, Privy-council to the King, August 12 and 13, 1545.

[2] August 23, 1545, Privy-council to Earl of Hertford; and August 27, 1545, Earl of Hertford and his Council to Secretary Paget. State-paper Office.

[3] Original in cipher, State-paper Office, with the deciphered copy in the handwriting of Sir R. Sadler, then with the army, September 9, 1545, at Irvine. From the Earls of Angus, Cassillis, and Sir George Douglas, to Hertford.

[4] Letter, Earl of Hertford and his Council to the King, Warkworth, September 18, State-paper Office.

England near Norham, burnt a single village, and, through the counsel of the Earl of Angus, on the first appearance of resistance, dispersed, and returned home.[1]

The army of Hertford began now to suffer want in a country which they had reduced to a desert; and it was thought expedient to retreat. After reconnoitring Hume castle, which was found too strong to be carried by assault, the English commander swept in desolating progress through the Merse, burnt the towns and villages, razed the forts and peels, and, returning to Horton on the 23d of September, dismissed his forces—placing his Italian and Spanish mercenaries in garrisons on the Borders.[2] It appears from an original document, that during this inroad, which only lasted fifteen days, the destruction was dreadful, and sufficiently accounts for the deep and exasperated feelings of the Scottish people. The English burnt seven monasteries and religious houses, sixteen castles and towns, five market towns, two hundred and forty-three villages, thirteen mills, and three hospitals.[3] Such were the arguments by which Henry endeavoured to persuade his neighbours that he was solicitous for a peaceful matrimonial union between the two countries. During the invasion a characteristic trait of the English monarch occurred. Some French soldiers in the service of the Scots deserted to Hertford, and the earl requested the king's advice whether they were to be received or trusted. His majesty, through his privy-council, replied that it was scarcely good policy to give credit to any men of that nation with whom he had mortal war, unless they would evince their sincerity by some previous exploit. He recommended Hertford, therefore, if any greater number of Frenchmen offered themselves, to "advise them first to some notable damage or displeasure to the enemy;" and he particularised the "trapping or killing the cardinal, Lorges, the governor, or some other man of estimation, whereby it can appear that they bear hearty good-will to serve, which thing" continues the king, "if they shall have done, your lordship may promise them not only to accept the service, but also to give them such reward as they shall have good cause to be therewith right well contented."[4]

After the retreat of Hertford, the governor held a parliament at Stirling, in which the Earl of Lennox and his brother, the Bishop of Caithness, were declared guilty of treason. The last meeting of the three estates had not been numerous, this was crowded by the nobles, and it was sarcastically said they came for land,[5] expecting a share in the division of the large estates of Lennox now forfeited to the crown. Argyle, whose services had been conspicuous amid the desertion of the country by other noble houses, was rewarded with the largest share, whilst Huntly, another firm adherent of the government, received for his brother the bishopric of Caithness, and a portion of the property of Lennox for himself.[6] It was determined, at the same parliament, that a force of a thousand men should be maintained for the defence of the marches, to be placed under the command of the bravest and most experienced Border barons; and a tax of sixteen thousand pounds was directed to be levied on the three estates for their support, whilst an additional body of a thousand men was raised at the expense of France.[7] The cardinal, it was reported, meant to pass over to

[1] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 40, corroborated by Orig. Letter of Hertford and his Council, Sept. 18, 1545, State-paper Office.

[2] Earl of Hertford and Council to the King, Horton, Sept. 23, 1545, State-paper Office.

[3] Statement of fortresses, towns, &c., burnt and destroyed during the expedition, State-paper Office.

[4] Original Draft, in Secretary Petre's handwriting, Privy-council to Earl of Hertford, September 2, 1545, State-paper Office.

[5] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 40.

[6] Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, vol. ii. pp. 458, 459. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 41. Keith's Catalogue, p. 128.

[7] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 41. The tax was to be raised conform to the Auld Taxations. * * Ilk pund land of auld extent eight shillings. Acts of Parliament, vol. ii. p. 460.

France with Lorges the French commander, with the purpose of subsidising a much larger force for the continuance of the war, whilst he laboured to induce the queen-mother, with the young queen, to reside in his castle of St Andrews; gaining the governor Arran to his views upon this point by tempting him with the splendid prize already offered to his ambition, the marriage of the young queen to his eldest son.

This intelligence was communicated to Henry by a letter in cipher from his active and unscrupulous correspondent the Laird of Brunston, (in a letter sent from Ormiston House, 6th October;) and in the same despatch he alluded darkly to his hopes that the intended journey of the cardinal to France would be cut short, assuring his royal employer that at no time were there more gentlemen desirous of doing him good service than at that moment.[1] He intimated, in a subsequent letter to Lord Hertford, his wish to have a private meeting with some one of the lords of the Privy-council; entreated that it might be kept secret, as a discovery might cost him both life and heritage; informed him that all his friends were ready whenever it pleased the king to command them; but stated that his majesty must be plain with them what he would have them to do, and explicit as to what they were to trust to on his part. In a letter of the same date from Brunston to the king, he requested a private interview with Sir R. Sadler at Berwick, reiterated his injunction of secrecy, as his communications might affect his life, and promised to communicate such things as should be greatly to the advancing of his majesty's affairs.[2] It seems probable from these expressions that the plot for the assassination of the cardinal had been resumed; and as Brunston directed the king to send his answer to Coldingham, then belonging to Sir George Douglas, we may presume that Angus, Cassillis, and the Scottish earls were acquainted with these proceedings. Unfortunately at this moment those invaluable documents, the letters in the State-paper Office, break off abruptly, perhaps we may add suspiciously: there is a *hiatus* from October to March 27th, an interval of five months; and we are compelled to trace the ravelled history of this obscure but interesting period with such inferior guidance as is attainable elsewhere.

The intelligence lately received, that Beaton meditated a journey to France, and that the nobles had consented to the marriage of the young queen to the son of the governor, stimulated the English monarch to fresh exertions. Caerlaverock, Lochmaben, and Thrave, three castles of first-rate strength and importance, were the property of his prisoner Lord Maxwell. To get possession of these, and garrison them as rallying points for his adherents, and to carry into execution the invasion of the west of Scotland by Lennox and the Lord of the Isles, were the two projects which engaged Henry's attention. Lord Maxwell, like his other brethren, had been at first kindly treated by the king on the condition of furthering his projects; but his conduct was suspicious and vacillating; he possessed not the greatness of mind to remain in durance and continue faithful to his country, whilst he hesitated to devote himself exclusively to England. Threatened with being remanded to the Tower as a punishment for his repeated deceit, he was reduced to despair, offered to serve under Hertford with a red cross on his armour to shew that he was a true Englishman, and at last purchased his return to Scotland at the price of the delivery of Caerlaverock.[3] But misfortune

[1] Letter in cipher, Laird of Brunston to the king's majesty, enclosed in a letter from the Earl of Hertford to Secretary Paget, October 20, 1545, State-paper Office. See extract in the Illustrations to this volume, letter B.

[2] Letter in cipher, with contemporary decipher, Brunston to the king, Calder, October 20, 1545, State-paper Office. See extract in the Illustrations, letter B.

[3] Earl of Hertford, Bishop of Durham, and Sir R. Sadler to Secretary Paget, July 29, 1545, State-paper Office. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 41.

pursued him: early in November the governor and the cardinal attacked and stormed this fortress, whilst Lochmaben and Thrave, held by his sons, experienced a similar fate; and Maxwell himself, being taken with his English confederates, was imprisoned in Dumfries.

For this disappointment Henry comforted himself with the hopes of success in the projected expedition against the west of Scotland. This prince, however, was either too precipitate or too dilatory.

Donald, lord of the Isles, who in August had passed over to Ireland with a potent fleet, in vain expected the arrival of Lennox, then absent with the English army in Scotland; and after a sojourn of some months returned to find an obscure grave in his own dominions. He bequeathed, however, his affection to the English king, and the more substantial hope of inheriting his pension, to his successor in the sovereignty of the Isles, James Macconnell, lord of Dunyveg; and Lennox having received information from Glencairn that the time was favourable for the recovery of the castle of Dumbarton, passed rapidly over to Ireland, opened a communication with the new Lord of the Isles, despatched his brother to practise on the fidelity of the constable, and taking the command of a body of two thousand men which had been levied by the Earl of Ormond, sailed from Dublin on the 17th of November with a formidable squadron.[1] Such an armament, according to the opinion expressed by the Irish Privy-council, had not left Ireland for the last two hundred years.[2]

Yet so great was the activity of Arran and the cardinal, that all these high hopes and preparations were destined to prove abortive. It appears that the arrival of Lennox's brother, the Bishop of Caithness, and the admission of this prelate into the castle, had alarmed them. Stirling of Glorat, the constable, received Caithness with distinction; yet, as he had already refused to deliver the fortress to Lennox, he now declared that he would hold it out against all till his mistress the queen was of age to demand it for herself. It was closely besieged by Arran, Huntly, and Argyle; but having defied their utmost efforts, the cardinal and Huntly, who knew that the resolution of Scottish barons in that age was sooner moved by interest than by force, began to tamper with the ex-bishop and the constable, and succeeded in corrupting them. Caithness, bribed by the promise of his restoration to the see he had lost, proved false to his brother; and Stirling, for a high reward, was induced to deliver the fortress, in that age deemed impregnable, into the hands of the governor.[3] Henry's last hope was thus destroyed, and the armament of Lennox and Ormond, probably informed on their passage of the disastrous result, does not appear to have even attempted a descent. Whether it retraced its course to Dublin, or, as on a former occasion, steered for Bristol, is not easily discoverable. It is, indeed, a curious illustration of the imperfection and carelessness of our general historians, both English and Scottish, that in neither the one nor the other do we find the slightest notice of a maritime expedition, which, by the letters of the Privy-council, seems in its outfit to have exhausted the exchequer and military resources of Ireland.

In his first invasion of Scotland Lennox had lost the powerful assistance of the Islesmen by his delay; in this last expedition he was deprived of it by precipitation. Had he waited for the arrival in Ireland of his envoy Colquhoun, whom he had sent to the Isles, he might have met with better success. James Macconnell, now Lord of the Isles, inherited all the animosity of his predecessor against Scot-

[1] "The 17th this present month of November, the Earl of Lennox, together with th' Erle of Ormond, toke their journey out of your porte of Dublin, accompanied with 2000 men." Letter, Privy-council of Ireland to the king, 19th November 1545, State-paper Office.

[2] Orig. Letter, Irish Privy-council to the king, 19th November 1545, State-paper Office.

[3] Lesley, Hist., p. 457.

land; and, as soon as the unsettled state of his remote dominions permitted, opened a negotiation with the English monarch, and entered warmly into his views. He proposed to Henry that Lennox should be sent with an army to the Isle of Sanda beside Cantire, where he promised to join him with the whole strength of his kinsmen and allies; with Alane Maclane of Gigha, his cousin, Clanranald, Clancameron, Clankayn, and his own surname or clan both north and south.[1] To these offers of this potent insular prince, the reply of Henry does not appear. They did not reach him, indeed, till the 15th February 1545–6, and before he had time to open a negotiation it is probable that the attention of the monarch was engrossed by the extraordinary events which took place in Scotland.

To explain these, it will be necessary to look back for a few moments to the progress of the reformed opinions in that country. Notwithstanding the utmost exertions of the cardinal, and the check which they had received from the apostacy of the governor, the doctrines of the Reformation had continued, since the last cruel executions at Perth,[2] to make a very perceptible progress. By many of those nobles, whom we have found in secret communication with England, they were openly professed; the Earls of Cassillis, Glencairn, and Marshal; the Lords Maxwell and Somerville; Crichton, laird of Brunston, with whose intrigues we are familiar; Cockburn of Ormiston, Sandilands of Calder, Douglas of Lang-Niddry, and many other barons and gentlemen, declared their conviction of their truth, condemned with just indignation the zeal which had kindled the flames of persecution in the country, and found an argument for the matrimonial alliance with England, in the support it must give to those who earnestly desired to see a purer faith and a more primitive worship established in Scotland. This forms the best ground for their apology in their intrigues with Henry, and their designs for the subjection of the country to England; although it is not to be concealed, that in their secret correspondence with the English monarch, the establishment of true religion is rarely alluded to as a motive of action.

In those early days of the Reformed Church, its sincere converts had arisen, with few exceptions, amongst the religious orders themselves, or from the middle and lower classes of the people, men not wholly illiterate, as they have been unjustly represented, but who were led to the study of the Scriptures by their love of the truth, and over whose motives no suspicion of selfishness or of interest can be thrown. When such persons were dragged before the ecclesiastical tribunals, and refused to purchase their lives at the price of a recantation, the spectacle exhibited by their death compelled even the most indifferent spectator to some inquiry; and these inquiries led, in many cases, to conviction and conversion. Neither, during the whole of the period of which we now speak, were men exposed to such severities of persecution. Arran himself, the governor of the kingdom, was at one time a convert; and so long as he continued the profession of the reformed opinions, the Scriptures, under the authority of parliament, were openly read, the new doctrines preached by Rough and Williams within his household, and the books of the most eminent Reformers allowed to be imported into the country. His return, however, to the Roman Catholic Church produced a melancholy change; and the influence acquired over his mind by Hamilton, the abbot of Paisley, had the worst effects upon the infant Reformation. His preachers, as we have seen, were dismissed; the professors of the new opinions discountenanced and persecuted; the cardinal and his party artfully represented all innovators in religion as enemies to their country—an argument to which the conduct of the Earls of Cassillis, Glencairn, and the Douglases, gave much

[1] Privy-council of Ireland to the Privy-council of England, 16th February 1545, with the Lord of the Isles' letter enclosed. State-paper Office.

[2] Supra, p. 21.

force; it was deemed impossible that a man should be at the same time a friend to the independence of Scotland, and a friend to the independence of the human mind; the spirit of inquiry which had begun was suddenly put down, and the people were compelled once more to submit themselves to those blind guides, who were often remarkable for little else than their ignorance and licentiousness. The Catholic Church in Scotland had, indeed, in former times, been distinguished by some men who combined profound learning with a primitive simplicity of faith; even in this age it could boast of its scholars and poets; but at the period of which we now speak, its character for sanctity of manners, ecclesiastical learning, or zeal for the instruction of the people in the Word of life, did not rank high; and the example of its head and ruler, Beaton, a prelate stained by open profligacy, and remarkable for nothing but his abilities as a statesman and politician, was fitted to produce the worst effects upon the great body of the inferior clergy.

Such was the state of things when, in July 1543, George Wishart, commonly known by the name of the Martyr, returned to Scotland, in the company of those commissioners whom we have seen despatched for the negotiation of the marriage treaty with England.[1] Of his early history little is known with certainty. It is probable that he was the son of James Wishart of Pittarro, justice-clerk to James the Fifth; and as he was patronised in youth by John Erskine of Dun, well known as one of the earliest enemies of the Roman Catholic Church, to him he may have owed his instructions in the principles of the Reformation. Erskine was provost of Montrose; and here Wishart first became known as master of a school, where he evinced his zeal and learning by an attempt to instruct his pupils in Greek, as the original language of the New Testament. This exposed him to persecution; he fled to England, preached at Bristol against the offering of prayers to the Virgin; and being condemned for that alleged heresy, openly recanted his opinions, and burnt his faggot in the church of St Nicholas in that city. This happened in 1538. His history during the three following years is little known, but we again find him in England, and at Cambridge, in 1543. There his character was marked by a devotion slightly tinged with asceticism, but deep and sincere; by his ample charities to the poor, his meekness to his brethren and pupils, and the universality of his learning. On the other hand, to such as despised his instructions, there was about him a zeal and severity of reproof, which irritated the wicked, and sometimes even exposed his life to danger. Such at least is the description given of him by an affectionate pupil, who had spent a year under his tuition; and it is confirmed by Knox, his early disciple:

It may easily be imagined that the appearance at this time of such a man in Scotland was calculated to produce important effects. On his return, his chief supporters were the Earls of Cassillis and Glencairn, the Earl Marshal, Sir George Douglas, and the Lairds of Brunston, Ormiston, and Calder. Protected by their presence and influence, he preached in the towns of Montrose, Dundee, Perth, and Ayr, inveighing against the errors of Popery, and the profligacy of the Churchmen, with a severity and eloquence which made frequent converts, and led in some cases to acts of popular violence. At Dundee the houses of the Black and Gray Friars were destroyed;[2] similar attacks were attempted, but suppressed, in the capital; and when a regard for the preservation of peace and order induced the civil authorities to interfere, Wishart did not hesitate to threaten them with those de-

[1] This date of his arrival is important, as it marks the commencement of his preaching, and has been mistaken by Knox and all our ecclesiastical historians. All are agreed that Wishart arrived with the commissioners, and they certainly arrived in the interval between the 16th and the 31st of July 1543. This may be seen by comparing Sadler, vol. i. p. 235, with pp. 242-245.

[2] Hamilton Papers quoted by Chalmers, Life of Mary, vol. ii. p. 403. See Illustrations, letter C.

nunciations of coming vengeance, by some writers pronounced prophetic; but for which there is no evidence that their author claimed this distinction. He enjoyed, it is to be remembered, the confidential intimacy, nay, we have reason to believe, that his councils influenced the conduct of Cassillis, Glencairn, Brunston, and the party which were now the advisers of Henry's intended hostilities,—a circumstance which will perfectly account for the obscure warnings of the preacher without endowing him with inspiration.[1]

From the time of his arrival in the summer 1543, for more than two years Wishart appears to have remained in Scotland, protected by the barons who were then in the interest of Henry, and who favoured the doctrines of the Reformation. Of his personal history during this period little is known. He continued his denunciations of the Roman Catholic superstitions, and inveighed with so much eloquence against the corrupt lives of the Churchmen, that, incurring the extreme odium of Beaton, he is said to have twice escaped the plots which this unscrupulous prelate had laid for his life.[2] It was during this interval, as we have already seen, that Henry the Eighth encouraged the conspiracy of Brunston, Cassillis, Glencairn, and others, to assassinate his enemy the cardinal. Of the existence of the plots against his life, Beaton was, to a certain degree, aware; and, looking with suspicion on Wishart, not only as a disseminator of forbidden doctrines, but the friend of his most mortal enemies, he earnestly laboured to apprehend him. Of all this the reformer was so well advised from the spies of the English party, that he repeatedly alluded to his approaching fate. Yet, for a considerable time, he escaped every effort made against him. Nor was this surprising. When he preached, he was surrounded by mail-clad barons and their armed retainers. Since the time his life had been attempted, a two-handed sword was carried before him by some tried follower, and he himself, though generally meek and humble, shewed occasional outbreakings of a courage and fire which marked the education of a feudal age.

At length his anticipations were accomplished. Being at Dundee, he received a message from the Earl of Cassillis and the gentlemen of Kyle and Cunningham, requesting him to meet them in Edinburgh, where they intended to make interest that he should have a public disputation with the bishops. Wishart, obeying the summons, travelled to the capital, but his friends not having met him as they promised, he kept himself concealed for some days. He could not, however, restrain his desire to address the people; and being protected by the barons of Lothian, many of whom had then embraced the reformed opinions, he preached publicly at Leith, and afterwards at Inveresk, where Sir George Douglas declared his approbation of the doctrine, and his resolution to defend the person of the teacher. It was at this time, also, that John Knox, already in middle life, became deeply affected by his instructions, and eagerly attached himself to his society.[3]

During these transactions the governor and the cardinal arrived in Edinburgh; and Wishart's friends, Crichton of Brunston, and Cockburn of Ormiston, considering his residence at Leith unsafe, removed him to West

[1] It was a little before the 4th of September 1543 that the riots took place at Dundee; and though Knox does not give the date, we may presume, with a near approach to certainty, that it was at this time Wishart was interdicted from preaching in that city. Now, a week only before this, Cassillis, Glencairn, Angus, and Maxwell, with all their adherents, were mustering their forces for a great effort, and had advised Henry the Eighth to send a main army into Scotland, (Sadler, vol. i. pp. 278-280;) whilst the Laird of Brunston, Wishart's great friend and protector, was to be sent on a mission to that monarch from the governor. The preacher thus lived in the intimacy of those who knew that a visitation of fire and sword was already determined on Scotland; and he naturally, perhaps justifiably, availed himself of that knowledge to make a salutary impression on his hearers.

[2] It ought to be stated that, in support of this assertion, we have no evidence from original or contemporary letters.

[3] Knox's History, p. 52.

Lothian, where he remained concealed, in expectation of the arrival of Cassillis.[1] It is possible that the reformer was ignorant of the true character of Brunston,—a dark and busy intriguer, who, for more than two years, had been organising a conspiracy for the assassination of the cardinal. But if Wishart knew nothing of this, Beaton, as we have seen, was aware of the escapes he had made, and the snares still preparing against him; and when he heard that the preacher was in the neighbourhood, living under the protection of Brunston, waiting for the arrival of Cassillis, who had also offered to assassinate him, and about to hold a meeting with his enemies at Edinburgh, we are not to be surprised that he determined on his instant apprehension. That the reformer was aware of his danger is certain, for he alluded to it. Cassillis had failed to meet him; the power of his enemies was increasing; his congregations began to fall away; yet he resolved, amid all discouragements, once more to address the people, and in his last and most remarkable sermon, delivered at Haddington, alluded to the miseries about to fall upon the country. He then took a solemn farewell of his audience, and set out for the house of Ormiston, accompanied by Brunston, Sandilands of Calder, and Cockburn of Ormiston. At this moment Knox pressed to his side and eagerly desired to accompany him, offering to bear the two-handed sword, as he was wont; but Wishart affectionately dismissed him. "Nay," said he, "return to your pupils: one is sufficient for a sacrifice." At Ormiston that night he appeared unusually cheerful, addressed the friends assembled round him after supper, taking for his subject the death of God's children, and, after having sung a psalm, retired to rest. At midnight the house was surrounded by a party of soldiers; a loud voice from without, which was immediately recognised as that of the Earl of Bothwell, summoned its inmates to surrender; and Wishart, awakening with the clang of arms in the court, at once apprehended the cause, and resolved to submit.[2] Resistance, indeed, would have been hopeless. The cardinal, by whom Bothwell had been sent, was within a mile, at the head of five hundred men; and Wishart, after an assurance that his life and person should be safe, surrendered himself to his captors. He was instantly carried to Elphinston, where Beaton lay, who, finding that one victim only was taken, sent with the utmost expedition to seize his companions. In the confusion, Brunston escaped to the neighbouring woods, whilst Cockburn and Sandilands were apprehended, and shut up in the castle of Edinburgh. Meanwhile Bothwell carried his prisoner to Hailes, his own residence, and for some time appeared resolved to keep his promise; but at last the incessant importunity of Beaton, and the expectation of a high reward, got the better of his resolution, and the mean and mercenary baron delivered his victim into the hands of the cardinal.[3]

Having secured him, Beaton was not of a temper to hesitate in his measures, or adopt a middle course. He summoned a council of the bishops and dignified clergy to meet at St Andrews; requested the governor to nominate a judge whose presence might give a civil sanction to their proceedings; and, being refused by the timidity or humanity of Arran, determined to proceed on his own authority.[4] The alleged heretic was immediately arraigned before the spiritual tribunal, and defended his opinions meekly but firmly, and with a profound knowledge of Scripture. He appealed to the Word of God as the sole rule by which he was guided in the doctrines he had taught the people; as he was ready to admit all its precepts, so was he bound, he declared, to refuse and deny everything which it condemned, whilst he deemed of little consequence such points as it left in obscurity. He maintained his

[1] Spottiswood's History, pp. 76-78. M'Crie's Life of Knox, vol. i. pp. 42-78.

[2] Knox's History, pp. 53, 54.

[3] Spottiswood's History, p. 79.

[4] Lesley, p. 101. Knox's History, pp. 55, 56.

right to preach, notwithstanding his excommunication by the Church, and contended that any man, with fervent faith, and a sufficient knowledge of Scripture, might be a teacher of the Word of life. He declared the insufficiency of outward ceremonies to salvation when the heart was unaffected, derided auricular confession, and admitted only such sacraments as were recorded in Scripture. Of fasting he warmly approved; upheld the Lord's Supper as a Divine and comfortable institution; maintained the necessity of our fully understanding the vows taken for us in our baptism; condemned the invocation of saints and the doctrine of purgatory as unscriptural, and asserted his belief that, immediately after death, the soul would pass into a state of immortal life and unfading felicity. Whilst he defended his own creed, supporting it by a constant reference to Scripture, he did not hesitate to stigmatise the doctrine of his opponents in unmeasured terms; pronouncing it "pestilential, blasphemous, and abominable, not proceeding from the inspiration of God, but the suggestions of the devil." The result of all this was easy to be anticipated; Wishart was found guilty of heresy, and sentenced to be burned. The trial took place at St Andrews, and no time was lost in carrying the sentence into effect.[1]

On the 28th of March he was led from the prison, with a rope about his neck, and a large chain round his middle, to the place of execution, in front of the castle, which was the archiepiscopal palace of the cardinal. Here a scaffold had been raised, with a high stake firmly fixed in the midst of it. Around it were piled bundles of dry faggots; beside them stood an iron grate containing the fire, and near it the solitary figure of the executioner. Nor did it escape the observation of the dense and melancholy crowd which had assembled, that the guns of the fortress were brought to bear directly on the platform, whilst the gunners stood with their matches beside them,—a jealous precaution, suggested, perhaps, by the attempt of Duncan to deliver the reformer Hamilton, and which rendered all idea of rescue in this case perfectly hopeless. On arriving at the place, Wishart beheld these horrid preparations, which brought before him the agony he was to suffer, with an unmoved countenance; mounted the scaffold firmly, and addressed a short speech to the people, in which he exhorted them not to be offended at the Word of God, by the sight of the torments which it seemed to have brought upon its preacher, but to love it, and suffer patiently for it any persecution which the sin of unbelieving men might suggest.[2] He declared that he freely forgave all his enemies, not excepting the judges who had unjustly condemned him. The executioner came up to him at this moment, fell on his knees, and begged his forgiveness with much earnestness, as he was not guilty of his death. "Most willingly do I tender it," said Wishart, and kissed him. "Now be of good courage, my heart, and do thine office; thou hast received a token that I forgive thee." He then knelt down and prayed audibly:—"O Thou Saviour of the world, have mercy on me; Father of heaven, into Thy hands I commit my spirit." Having thrice repeated these words, he arose from his knees, and declared, without any perceptible emotion, that he was ready. The hooks were then fixed in the iron chain which was girt round his loins; and being raised on the gibbet, and the faggots kindled, he was first strangled by the rope, which was pulled tightly round his neck, and then consumed to ashes.[3]

It was impossible for the people to behold unmoved so cruel an execution. It was remembered also that the governor had refused his concurrence,—that the sanction of the civil authority had been withheld; and the fate of Wishart was pronounced unjust and illegal. That many of his opinions were such as the Church deemed heretical could not be denied; but men

[1] Knox's History, pp. 59-66, inclusive.

[2] Knox, p. 64. Spottiswood, p. 82.

[3] Knox's History, pp. 68, 69. Spottiswood's History, pp. 81, 82.

had now begun to appeal to the Word of God as the test of the truth; and to be subjected to such inhuman torments for the declaration of precepts believed to be founded on the Bible, was esteemed monstrous. The courage, meekness, and patience with which the reformer had borne his sufferings, produced a deep effect, and the invariable results of persecution were soon discernible in a spirit of increasing investigation, a revulsion from the tyranny of power, and a steady progress in the new opinions.

But amid lamentations for their favourite preacher, deeper feelings were mingled. Whispers of revenge began to circulate amongst the people; hints were thrown out that God would not long suffer such cruelty to go unpunished; and, in those days of ignorance, when a stern fanaticism was mingled in the same minds with the darkness and cruelty of a feudal age, an opinion began to be entertained that the example of the Old Testament heroes, in cutting off a determined persecutor, was not unworthy of imitation. Such sentiments were not lost upon those men, who, under the influence of far baser motives, had, as we have seen, already organised a conspiracy for the assassination of the cardinal. Cassillis, Glencairn, Sir George Douglas, Crichton of Brunston, with the Laird of Grange and the Master of Rothes, had been prevented by various causes from accomplishing their purpose; the difficulty of binding Henry the Eighth to a direct promise of reward, and the discernment of Beaton, who, although he could not wholly discover, detected the working of some dark purpose against his life, had interrupted and balked the authors of the plot; and they hailed the feelings excited by the fate of Wishart as a new means placed in their hands for the accelerating the catastrophe which they so ardently desired.

With the people Beaton had formerly been popular, as the determined enemy of England; but they now openly inveighed against his cruelty. John Lesley, brother of the Earl of Rothes, did not hesitate to declare in public that he would have blood for blood; and his nephew, Norman Lesley, with Kirkaldy of Grange, had entered into a close correspondence with England.[1] With these, others of inferior name, but of higher honesty, were associated; and it cannot be doubted that some men, who before the death of Wishart would have spurned at any proposal of an association with persons whose motives were so mercenary, were induced, after that event, to applaud, and even to join in their attempt. Of all these circumstances Brunston and his friends were not slow to avail themselves: nor are we to forget, that if their minds had been already made up on the necessity of ridding themselves of the cardinal, the desire of avenging the fate of their friend must have whetted their slumbering purpose to new activity.

It is probable that Beaton, naturally presumptuous, disregarded any open threats as the ebullition of impotent resentment. The voice of his flatterers amongst the clergy declared that his salutary severity had saved the Church; he was strong in the alliance of France; the schemes of the English faction had latterly been unsuccessful; and it is said that, adopting a practice common in that age, he had strengthened himself by procuring bonds of manrent from Norman Lesley, and many of the most powerful nobles. Soon after the death of Wishart, he took a progress into Angus, and was present at the marriage of one of his natural daughters, Margaret Bethune, to David Lindsay, master of Crawford, which was celebrated with great magnificence at Finhaven castle, the prelate bestowing upon the bride a dowry little inferior to that of a princess.[2]

When absent on this festive occasion, intelligence was brought that Henry the Eighth was urging forward his preparations for a new invasion; and he hurried to Fife with the object of fortifying his castle of St Andrews, which he dreaded might be made a

1 Knox's History, p. 70. Spottiswood's History, p. 82.
2 Knox's History, p. 70.

principal point of attack, and of procuring the barons, whose estates were contiguous to the coast, to strengthen it against the enemy. In the last invasion, the country, without a blow, had been abandoned to indiscriminate devastation; and having resolved to prevent a repetition of such disgrace, he summoned a meeting of the neighbouring gentry to consult on the best means for the defence of the kingdom.

In the midst of these exertions he seems to have forgotten the secret enemies by whom he was surrounded, whilst they continued more warily than before to hold correspondence with England. In his last letters, the Laird of Brunston, whose mortal enmity to Beaton has been amply shewn, complained to Lord Wharton that the King of England was neither sufficiently definite in his commands, nor explicit in his promises of reward; but he expressed, at the same time, the readiness of his friends to serve the king, his wish to have a meeting with Lord Wharton in the most secret manner, as a discovery might cost him both life and heritage, and his fervent expectation, that although Beaton now intended a voyage to France, it would be cut short.[1] There seems, however, reason to believe, that although the designs for the assassination of the prelate had been long maturing, and were thus gradually gathering round him, a private quarrel between him and Norman Lesley precipitated their accomplishment. This young baron, known by the name of the Master of Rothes, had resigned to Beaton, on the promise of a valuable equivalent, the estate of Easter Wemyss in Fife.[2] In the meeting at St Andrews he claimed the stipulated reward, and receiving what he deemed an equivocal reply, remonstrated with freedom; warm words followed; the cardinal complained of insulted dignity; and Norman, answering with scorn, departed in deep wrath. Repairing to his uncle, John Lesley, he complained of the injury he had sustained, and both were of opinion that after what had passed delay would be dangerous. Messages were accordingly sent to the Laird of Grange and others, whose readiness to join in the attempt had, we may presume, been already ascertained; and it was determined that the murder should be committed without delay.

On the evening of the 28th of May Norman Lesley came, with only five followers, to St Andrews, and rode, without exciting suspicion, to his usual inn. William Kirkaldy of Grange was there already; and they were soon joined by John Lesley, who took the precaution of entering the town after nightfall, as his appearance, from his known enmity to Beaton, might have raised alarm. Next morning at daybreak the conspirators assembled in small detached knots in the vicinity of the castle; and the porter having lowered the drawbridge to admit the masons employed in the new works, Norman Lesley, and three men with him, passed the gates, and inquired if the cardinal was yet awake? This was done without suspicion; and as they were occupied in conversation, James Melville, Kirkaldy of Grange, and their followers entered unnoticed; but on perceiving John Lesley, who followed, the porter instantly suspected treason, and springing to the drawbridge, had unloosed its iron fastening, when the conspirator Lesley anticipated his purpose by leaping across the gap. To despatch the porter with their daggers, cast the body into the fosse, and seize the keys of the castle, employed but a few minutes, and all was done with such silence, as well as rapidity, that no alarm had been given. With equal quietness, the workmen who laboured on the ramparts were led to the gate and dismissed; Kirkaldy, who was acquainted with the castle, then took his station at a private postern, through

[1] At this moment (20th October 1545) our best guides, the State Papers, unfortunately fail us, and the rest of the history of Beaton's death is to be gathered from less authentic sources. That these friends of Brunston, so willing to obey the commands of Henry, were the same men who had formerly offered, through Brunston, to slay the cardinal, there seems little reason to doubt.

[2] Spottiswood's History, p. 82.

which alone any escape could be made; and the rest of the conspirators going successively to the apartments of the different gentlemen who formed the prelate's household, awoke them, and threatening instant death if they spoke, led them, one by one, to the outer wicket, and dismissed them unhurt. In this manner a hundred workmen and fifty household servants were disposed of by a handful of men, who, closing the gates, and dropping the portcullis, were complete masters of the castle.[1] Meanwhile Beaton, the unfortunate victim against whom all this hazard had been encountered, was still asleep; but awakening and hearing an unusual bustle, he threw on a nightgown, and drawing up the window of his bedchamber, inquired what it meant. Being answered that Norman Lesley had taken the castle, he rushed to the private postern; but seeing it already guarded, returned speedily to his apartment, seized his sword, and, with the assistance of his page, barricaded the door on the inside with his heaviest furniture. John Lesley now coming up, demanded admittance. "Who are you?" said the cardinal. "My name," he replied, "is Lesley." "Is it Norman?" asked the unhappy man, remembering, probably, the bond of manrent; "I must have Norman; he is my friend." "Nay, I am not Norman," answered the ruffian, "but John, and with me ye must be contented;" upon which he called for fire, and was about to apply it to the door, when it was unlocked from within. The conspirators now rushed in; and Lesley and Carmichael throwing themselves furiously upon their victim, who earnestly implored mercy, stabbed him repeatedly. But Melville, a milder fanatic, who professed to murder, not from passion, but religious duty, reproved their violence. "This judgment of God," said he, "ought to be executed with gravity, although in secret;" and presenting the point of his sword to the bleeding prelate, he called on him to repent of his wicked courses, and especially of the death of the holy Wishart, to avenge whose innocent blood they were now sent by God. "Remember," said he, "that the mortal stroke I am now about to deal is not the mercenary blow of a hired assassin, but the just vengeance which hath fallen on an obstinate and cruel enemy of Christ and the Holy Gospel." On his saying this, he repeatedly passed his sword through the body of his unresisting victim, who sank down from the chair to which he had retreated, and instantly expired.[2]

The alarm had now risen in the town; the common bell was rung; and the citizens, with their provost, running in confused crowds to the side of the fosse, demanded admittance, crying out that they must instantly speak with my lord cardinal. They were answered from the battlements that it would be better for them to disperse, as he whom they called for could not come to them, and would not trouble the world any longer. This, however, only irritated them the more, and being urgent that they would speak with him, Norman Lesley reproved them as unreasonable fools, who desired an audience of a dead man; and dragging the body to the spot, hung it by a sheet over the wall, naked, ghastly, and bleeding from its recent wounds. "There," said he, "there is your god; and now that ye are satisfied, get you home to your houses,"—a command which the people instantly obeyed.[3]

Thus perished Cardinal David Beaton, the most powerful opponent of the reformed religion in Scotland, by an act which some authors, even in the present day, have scrupled to call murder. To these writers the secret and long-continued correspondence of the conspirators with England was unknown,—a circumstance, perhaps, to be regretted, as it would have spared some idle and angry reasoning. By its disclosure we have been enabled to

[1] Knox's History, pp. 71, 72. Letter, James Lindsay to Lord Wharton, State-paper Office. See Illustrations, letter B, Remarks on the Murder of Beaton.

[2] Knox's History, pp. 71, 72. Lesley, p. 191.

[3] Spottiswood's History, p. 83.

trace the secret history of these iniquitous times, and it may now be pronounced, without fear of contradiction, that the assassination of Beaton was no sudden event, arising simply out of indignation for the fate of Wishart, but an act of long-projected murder, encouraged, if not originated, by the English monarch, and, so far as the principal conspirators were concerned, committed from private and mercenary considerations.[1]

CHAPTER II.

MARY.

1546—1554.

THE murder of Cardinal Beaton was followed, as might have been anticipated, by results the most important. It removed from the head of affairs a man, whose talents for political intrigue, and whose vigorous and unscrupulous character, had for some time communicated strength and success to the government; it filled with alarm that party in Scotland which was attached to the ancient faith, and cherished the freedom and independence of the country; whilst it infused new spirit into the powerful faction which had been courted and kept in pay by Henry the Eighth, and through whose assistance this monarch looked forward to the accomplishment of his favourite schemes—the marriage of the youthful Queen of Scotland to his son the Prince of Wales, the establishment of the Reformation, and the entire subjugation of this country under the dominion of England.

If the fact had not been already apparent, the events which immediately succeeded the assassination of the cardinal rendered it impossible for any one to escape the conclusion, that the conspiracy had been encouraged by the English monarch. Scarcely was the act perpetrated, when letters were despatched to Lord Wharton the English warden, by some of those numerous spies whom he retained, describing the consternation which the event had produced in the capital, the change in affairs which was likely to ensue, and the necessity for immediate exertion on the part of his master.[2] On the other hand, the conspirators, who had seized the castle of St Andrews, were soon joined by many adherents, previously the most zealous supporters of the English interests; and who, although not present at the murder, believed that it would subject them to suspicion and persecution;[3] amongst these the most noted was John Knox, the great advocate and supporter of the Reformation.

This extraordinary man, whose future career was connected with so many great events, was now forty years old. Born in 1505 of parents in the middle rank of rural life, and wealthy enough to give him a learned education, he had been sent in 1521 to the University of Glasgow, where he distinguished himself in philosophy

[1] See Illustrations, letter B.

[2] MS. Letter in State-paper Office. Original from Lord Wharton, June 2, 1546, enclosing three letters which he had received from Scotland.

[3] Anderson's MS. History, vol. ii. p. 80, dorso. They amounted to seven score persons; among them the Laird of Grange, Henry Balnaves, a Senator of the College of Justice, Henry Primrose, the Laird of Pitmillie, Mr John Lesley, Sir John Auchenleck, and sundry gentlemen of the name of Melvin.

and scholastic theology, and took priests' orders, previous, it is said, to his having attained the regular canonical age. It is difficult to fix the time when his mind became unsettled on the grounds of his adherence to the communion of the Roman Catholic Church, and it is remarkable that the labours of his numerous biographers have left his history from birth to middle age almost a blank. The fact asserted by Beza, of his having been condemned as a heretic and degraded from the priesthood, rests on no certain evidence. It has been stated also, by Dr M'Crie, that he publicly professed himself a Protestant in 1542. This learned author, however, has given no satisfactory authority for this fact, and I have found no trace of such a public declaration of his belief previous to the capture and execution of George Wishart in 1545. But the step which he now took was decisive. By casting in his lot with the assassins of the cardinal he openly declared his approval of the principles on which they acted; and they, as we may easily believe, warmly welcomed such an accession to their party.

Whilst such was the conduct of the English faction, the governor Arran and the queen-regent exerted themselves to maintain the cause of order, and to bring to punishment those bold and daring men who had so unscrupulously taken the law into their own hands.[1] A convention of the nobility, spiritual and temporal, was held at Stirling on the 10th of June; and nothing was left unattempted by which a cordial union might be promoted amongst the parties which separated and distracted the state. The meeting was attended by the chief persons of both factions: by the Earls of Angus, Cassillis, and Glencairn, to whose devotion to the English interests many of the late disorders might be attributed; as well as by Huntly, Argyle, and the Lords Fleming and Elphinston, who were the leaders in the faction attached to France, and interested in the support of the ancient faith.[2] To conciliate the lords of the English party, Arran the governor solemnly renounced the contract for the marriage of the young queen to his son; the "bands" or feudal agreements by which many of the nobles had promised to see this alliance carried into effect were annulled, and, at the same time, the queen-regent released from their written obligations all such barons as had stipulated to oppose the ambitious matrimonial designs of the governor.[3] On the other hand, the Earl of Angus, Sir George Douglas, and Lord Maxwell,[4] cordially embraced the interest of the queen-regent; approved of the late act of the Scottish parliament, which had dissolved the peace with England; derided all idea of a marriage between Prince Edward and the young queen; and renounced for ever all those "bands" by which they had tied themselves to Henry, and which had been repeatedly renewed, or forgotten, as their private interest seemed to dictate: Maxwell, who was now made warden of the west marches, once more took possession of the strong castle of Lochmaben; and twenty peers were selected, out of which number four were directed to remain every successive month with the governor at his secret council.[5]

[1] Knox's History, p. 74. Maitland, vol. ii. p. 866.

[2] MS. Book of the Privy-council of Scotland. Entitled, Liber Secreti Consilii, 1545, fol. 28, p. 2. The members present were the Bishops of Orkney and Galloway; the Earls of Angus, Huntly, Argyle, Bothwell, Glencairn, and Sutherland; the commendator of Kelso, the Abbots of Melrose, Paisley, Dunfermline, Cupar, Crosregal, Dryburgh, and Culross; with the Lords Fleming, Ruthven, Maxwell, Somerville, Hay of Yester, Innermeith, Elphinston, Livingstone, Erskine, Sir George Douglas, and Sir William Hamilton.

[3] MS. Book of Privy-council, fol. 30, p. 2.

[4] In Anderson's MS. History, vol. ii. p. 81, we find that Robert, lord Maxwell, died in July 1546, and his second son John returned home out of England, and took upon him the government of the country within the wardenry.

[5] On the expiration of the month, their place was to be occupied by other four chosen from the remaining sixteen, and so on throughout the year. Care was also taken to select at this convention each party of four who were to serve in rotation, and to intimate to them the month during which they were to give their attendance on the governor; and it was agreed that when five months had expired, the same councillors should resume

The Lords Erskine and Livingston were continued in their charge of the person of the young queen; and the important office of chancellor, now vacant by the assassination of Beaton, was conferred upon the tried fidelity of the Earl of Huntly.[1] Peace having been lately concluded between England and France, and a clause inserted in the treaty, of which Scotland might, if she chose, avail herself, it was determined by the Privy-council that "the comprehension should be accepted, without prejudice to the queen, her realm, and its liberties." A conciliatory reply was at the same time directed to be made to the English monarch, who had complained of the depredations committed by Scottish privateers upon his merchantmen.[2]

Having endeavoured to secure the kingdom from without, it only remained to appease its internal commotions by adopting decided measures against the conspirators who held the castle of St Andrews. Accordingly,

their duties in the same order.—MS. Book of the Privy-council, fol. 29, p. i. "It is devised and ordained by the queen's grace, my lord governor, and hail lords convened in this convention, that certain lords remain with my lord governor, and be of secret council with him, and they to remain monthly with him, and that to the number of four. The 1st month to begin this day the 10th of June.

The 1st month,
10th June to 10th of July.
Robert, bishop of Orkney.
George, earl of Huntly.
William, lord Ruthven.
Sir George Douglas of Pittendreich, kt.
2d month.
Gavin, arch. of Glasgow.
Arch., earl of Angus.
Hew, lord Somerville.
George, abbot of Dunfermline.
3d month.
William, bishop of Dunblane.
Arch., earl of Argyle.
William, earl of Glencairn.
Donald, abbot of Cupar.
4th month.
Patrick, bishop of Moray.
Patrick, earl Bothwell.
Gilbert, earl Cassillis.
Malcolm, lord Fleming.
5th month.
William, earl Marshal.
William, earl of Montrose.
Andrew, bishop of Galloway.
Sir Wm. Hamilton of Sanquhar, kt."

[1] MS. Book of Privy-council, fol. 28, p. 2.
[2] Ibid., fol. 38, p. 1. Ibid., fol. 40, p. 2.

after an ineffectual attempt to negotiate, a parliament was convoked, (29th July 1546,)—in which they were declared guilty of treason:[3] proclamation was made, interdicting all persons from affording them the slightest assistance in their rebellion, and the governor having assembled an army, commenced the siege, with a determination speedily to reduce the fortress. This, however, was found a task of no easy execution: it was naturally strong, and its fortifications had been repaired at great expense by its late master; on the one side the sea rendered it impregnable, and on the land quarter the thickness of its walls defied the imperfect and ill-served artillery of the times. Beaton, from a principle of security, had provisioned it fully against attack, and even were it attempted to starve out the garrison, the English fleet which commanded the Firth might at any time throw in supplies. To secure this support, the conspirators, or *Castilians*[4] as they were termed, lost no time in opening a communication with Henry the Eighth. Kirkaldy of Grange, Balnaves, and John Lesley were sent as envoys to that monarch; and they returned with an assurance of his assistance, on condition that they would promote the marriage between the young queen and the Prince of Wales, and retain in their hands the eldest son of Arran, who had been made prisoner at the time they seized the castle.[5] Confident in their strength, the besieged derided all the efforts of the governor; and, despising the prayers and remonstrances of those enemies of the Catholic Church, men who, with a mistaken zeal for the Reformation, had joined their party, they abandoned themselves to every species of intemperate indulgence.[6] Meanwhile, month after month stole away without any perceptible progress in the siege. Application for assistance was made to France, by Panter, secretary to the

[3] Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, vol. ii. pp. 478, 479.
[4] So termed from their holding possession of the castle of Edinburgh.
[5] Anderson. MS. Hist., vol. ii. p. 82.
[6] Knox, History of Reformation, p. 83.

queen, who was sent ambassador to that country.[1] Remonstrances against any intended interference for the defence of the Castilians were addressed to England;[2] but after every effort had been exhausted, it was discovered that the only prospect of success lay in an endeavour to cut off all supplies and starve out the garrison. It may convey to us some idea of the imperfection of the military art in these times, when we find a single castle, with a small garrison, resisting for a long period the utmost efforts of the governor. To make himself master of it he divided the kingdom into four great districts, and the military force of each division was brought successively to bear upon the fortress,[3] yet without any nearer prospect of success. At length, towards the end of December, the garrison shewed a disposition to capitulate; their principal defences were greatly injured by the artillery, and they began to suffer from a scarcity of provisions and sickness.[4] Had Arran been aware of this, instead of listening to any offer for a cessation of hostilities, he might within a short period have made himself master of the place; but, ignorant of the real condition of the besieged, he accepted terms dictated to him by men who were at the last extremity. They consented to deliver up the castle as soon as a Papal absolution was obtained for the slaughter of the cardinal; they stipulated for a free pardon; and, in the interval between the commencement of the armistice and the arrival of the absolution, insisted on retaining the fortress, and keeping possession of the governor's son as a hostage for the performance of the treaty. At the same moment that these proposals were transmitted to Arran, the Castilians sent an envoy to Henry the Eighth, informing him of their proceedings, declaring that their only object was to gain time to revictual the castle; that they had no intention whatever of abiding by their agreement; and would thus be able to perform their first promises to the English monarch. For this purpose they requested Henry to write to the emperor, causing him to intercede with the Pope "for the stopping and hindering of their absolution," by which means a longer time would be given them to accomplish their purposes.[5]

Meanwhile Arran accepted the conditions of the armistice, being solicitous, as has been alleged, to protract the time till the arrival of foreign assistance; and intending to be as little faithful to his agreement as his opponents. He had despatched Panter the secretary as ambassador to France, with an earnest request that the French monarch would fulfil those treaties of alliance which had so long connected the two kingdoms; he called upon him, if Henry would not consent to peace with Scotland, to declare war against him; he entreated him to increase his fleet, the surest arm of defence against the enterprises of England; requested an immediate supply in money, arms, and artillery, and in consequence of the ignorance of the Scottish engineers, required the assistance of some experienced men, learned in the attack and defence of fortified places, and who understood the "ordering of battles."[6]

In the meantime an extraordinary and interesting scene took place within the besieged fortress. Knox, as we have seen, had retreated into the castle and joined the conspirators. He was

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 31st March 1547. Panter to the Protector Somerset.

[2] The governor consented to an act by which his eldest son, James Hamilton, then a prisoner, was disinherited till he should recover his freedom, and his second son appointed in his place. This precautionary measure was adopted to make it impossible that under any circumstances the throne should be occupied by a prince who was a captive in the hands of the enemy.—Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, vol. ii. p. 474.

[3] MS. Book of Privy-council, fol. 40, p. 1. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 42.

[4] MS., State-paper Office. Report of the Proceedings relative to the castle of St Andrews. It fixes the date of the appointment or armistice, which is variously given by our historians, to have been the 17th December.

[5] MS., State-paper Office. Report of the Proceedings relative to the castle of St Andrews.

[6] MS. Book of Privy-council, fol. 51, p. 2, fol. 52, p. 1. Articles to be desired at the King of France, for the help and supply to be given to this realm against the King of England.

accompanied by the Barons of Ormiston and Lang-Niddry and their sons, whose education he conducted. In the chapel within the fort he catechised his pupils, and delivered lectures on the Scriptures, where a little congregation was soon assembled, who earnestly entreated him to preach publicly to the people. This, however, he at first peremptorily declined, observing "that he would not run where God had not called him;"[1] but they who were deeply interested in his assuming the office of the ministry, for which they believed him to be eminently qualified, determined to overcome his reluctance. John Rough, whom we have seen dismissed, on account of his zeal for the Reformation, from the situation of chaplain to Arran the governor, had taken refuge with the rest in the fortress, and on a certain day which had been agreed on, having selected as the subject of his discourse the power resident in a congregation to elect their minister, and the danger of rejecting their call, he, on the conclusion of the sermon, turned abruptly to Knox who was present—"Brother," said he, "I charge you, in the name of God, in the name of His Son, and in the name of this congregation, who now call upon you by my mouth, that you take upon you the office of preaching, and refuse not this holy vocation, as you would avoid God's heavy displeasure." The address was solemn, and totally unexpected by Knox, who, confused and agitated, in vain attempted to reply, but bursting into tears, retired from the assembly.[2] After a few days of great conflict and distress of mind, he accepted the invitation; and without any further ceremony or ordination than that already received previous to his adoption of the reformed opinions, he assumed the public office of a preacher.[3] The reformer was then in the forty-first year of his age.

In the midst of these scenes occurred the death of Henry the Eighth, which was followed not long after by that of his great contemporary, Francis the First; but these events did not at first materially alter the policy of either kingdom. Francis, notwithstanding his occasional political predilection for the Protestants, had been an earnest disciple of the Roman Catholic Church; and the great preponderance of the house of Guise, under his successor, Henry the Second, inclined that monarch more vigorously to support the same party in Scotland. Immediately after his coronation, Monsieur d'Osell was despatched to that country to confirm the league which had so long bound its interests to France; assurances of support were liberally held out against the ambitious designs of England; and D'Osell, who enjoyed the intimate confidence of the queen-dowager, remained as ambassador at the Scottish court.[4]

In England, the accession of Edward the Sixth, then a promising boy in his tenth year, and the assumption of the protectorate by his uncle, the Earl of Hertford, now Duke of Somerset, brought no change of policy in dealing with Scotland. Henry, it is said, on his death-bed had earnestly recommended the prosecution of the war with that country, under the mistaken idea that the Scots would be compelled at the point of the sword to fulfil the treaty of marriage; and Somerset, by one of the first acts of his government, shewed a determination to carry this injunction into effect. On the 6th of February, Balnaves repaired to the English court as envoy from the Castilians, and received from the protector a confirmation of the annuities which had attached to England the conspirators against Beaton. It was resolved to strengthen the garrison of the castle by remitting money for the maintenance of troops; Lesley, one of the assassins, was commanded to remain at court to communicate with his friends; and Balnaves received injunctions, on his return to Scotland, to use his utmost efforts to seduce the nobility

[1] Knox's History, vol. i. p. 74.
[2] Ibid., p. 75.
[3] M'Crie's Life of Knox, p. 40. Edition 1812. Ibid., p. 43. Ibid., p. 11.

[4] Lesley, Bannatyne edition, p. 193. 31st March 1547.

from their allegiance to the governor.[1]

Somerset at the same time determined to lead an army into Scotland. He addressed a letter to the nobility of that realm, reminding them of the league by which they had bound themselves to assist the late King of England in the accomplishment of his designs; he called upon them for a performance of their promises; and so successful was Balnaves in his intrigues, that many of the Scottish nobles and barons shewed a readiness to repeat the same disgraceful game by which they had enriched themselves under the former reign.[2]

In the midst of these difficulties which disturbed his government, Arran exerted himself to create a vigorous union against the enemies of the country. Suspicious, from the experience of the former reign, that other designs than a simple matrimonial alliance were contemplated by England, and aware of the preparations for invading the kingdom, he laboured to attach the chief nobility to his service, to strengthen the Border defences, and to train the people, by weapon-schawings or armed musters, which had been of late much disused, to greater skill in military exercises; he encouraged the equipment of privateers and armed merchantmen, as the only substitute for a national fleet; and he anxiously endeavoured to compose those destructive and sanguinary feuds amongst some of the principal barons which had of late years greatly increased, and, even in the midst of peace, exposed the state to all the horrors of war.[3]

Such being the threatening aspect of both countries, hostilities could not be long delayed. A Scottish privateer, named the *Lion*, was captured by the *Pevensy*, an English ship: in reply to the remonstrances of the queen-dowager, it was affirmed that the former had been the aggressor:[4] and not long after a force of five thousand English broke across the western Borders, plundered the country, made prisoner the Laird of Johnston, with others of his surname, and seized and garrisoned many of the towers upon the marches.[5] To repel this aggression, which was loudly complained of as an open declaration of war, Arran assembled an army, advanced rapidly to the Borders, stormed and razed the castle of Langhope, and was about to pursue his advantage,[6] when he received intelligence that a French fleet had entered the Firth, and required his co-operation in the bombardment of St Andrews. Nothing could be more welcome than this event. During the armistice, the garrison, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Knox and others, who, for conscience' sake, now acted with their party, had abandoned themselves to the most flagrant excesses, ravaging the country, and behaving in a brutal and licentious manner to the poor victims who fell into their hands.[7] Trusting to the support of England, they had, on frivolous grounds, refused to abide by their agreement, when the Papal absolution arrived from Rome; and the governor, convinced that he had been the dupe of a convention which they had never meant to fulfil, was deeply incensed against them.

Hastening back, therefore, to the scene of action, he found in the bay a squadron of sixteen armed galleons, commanded by Leo Strozzi, prior of Capua, a knight of Rhodes, of great military experience. The vessels took up their line with much skill, so as at

[1] MS. Privy-council Records of Edward VI., p. 9.—Transcript by Gregory King, Lancaster herald.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office.—Laird of Langton to the Protector Somerset, August 18, 1547. Also Patrick, lord Gray, to the Protector, August 28, 1547.

[3] MS. Record of Privy-council of Scotland, sub annis 1546, 1547.

[4] Carte, vol. iii. p. 205. MS. Letter, State-paper Office. Queen-dowager to the Protector, 18th April 1547.

[5] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 43. Maitland, vol. ii. p. 867.

[6] Diurnal of Occurrents, pp. 43, 44. MS. Records of Privy Seal, July 24, 1547. Letter to George, earl of Huntly, of the Gift of the Gudis of George, earl of Caithness. The army was summoned to assemble at Peebles, 10th July 1547.

[7] Keith, p. 52. Knox's History, p. 83. Herries' Memoirs of the Reign of Mary, p. 17.

full tide completely to command the outworks towards the sea. The greater ordnance were landed, raised by engines and planted on the steeples of the abbey and St Salvator's college, which overlooked the inner court of the fortress; whilst some large battering mortars were dragged near the gates. During such preparations, the interior of the castle presented an extraordinary scene. Knox, disgusted by the licentiousness of the garrison, raised his awful voice, and denounced their speedy captivity as the just judgment of God. To the scoffs of the soldiers, who boasted of the strength of their towers and anticipated assistance from England, he declared that their sins had found them out, that their walls would shiver under the cannon, and their bodies be manacled in foreign prisons. Nor was the sentence long in finding its accomplishment. The fortifications which had resisted the ill-directed batteries of the Scottish governor, crumbled under the more effective cannonade of the Italian commander. A breach was soon effected; a proposal of the garrison for a sortie canvassed and abandoned as hopeless; and, within less than a week, a flag of truce was seen approaching. It brought from the besieged an offer to surrender, their lives and property being secured; but the condition was scornfully rejected by the governor and the queen. Strozzi declared that it was beyond his commission even to grant them their lives; and if he did so, it must be with reservation that it was afterwards approved of by the king his master. To this the garrison were compelled to submit. They would acknowledge no lawful authority in Scotland; the governor, they affirmed, had treacherously betrayed them, and their only transaction therefore should be with the King of France.[1] They were accordingly conveyed prisoners on board the fleet, the plunder of the castle was seized and divided by the victors; and Strozzi, by the advice of the governor, who dreaded it should fall into the hands of the English, dismantled the fortress, and levelled its defences with the ground. Others, however, ascribe its destruction to the zeal of fulfilling an injunction of the canon law, declaring the vengeance of extermination against any mansion that had witnessed the murder of a cardinal. The booty, which included the personal property of the prelate, amounted, in plate, copes, vestments, and jewels of great value, to a hundred thousand pounds, a prize which no doubt tempted the return of the French auxiliaries to Scotland. Beaton's death was now amply revenged, and Knox's predictions fulfilled; for the conspirators and their associates, on arriving in France, were partly distributed in the dungeons of various castles in Brittany; whilst others, including the reformer himself, were kept chained on board the galleys, and treated with the utmost rigour.[2]

With this success the governor was highly gratified. He already possessed Dumbarton, which the English had in vain attempted to recover; St Andrews, so lately an object of anxiety, and for the occupation of which the protector was making every effort, had now fallen; he had been partially successful in his enterprise upon the Bor-

[1] Anderson's MS. History, vol. ii. pp. 94, 95. Lesley, p. 194. Anderson says expressly, "At length he [Strozzi] was content to pardon them their lives, if the King of France should think it good, else to stand to his pleasure." Lesley, p. 194, repeats the same terms. Knox, in his History, gives a different account. The heads of the appointment, he affirms, were—1st, that their lives should be secured to them; 2d, that they should be safely conveyed to France; 3d, that if they chose to embrace the conditions proposed to them by the King of France, they should have their freedom, and be at liberty to enter his service; 4th, that if they refused, they should be conveyed, at the expense of France, to what country they chose, *except Scotland*. I have preferred the account of the terms of capitulation given in the text, as it appears best supported by the circumstances of the case; and it is confirmed not only by Anderson and Lesley, but partially by Buchanan, book xv. cap. 45—"Leonti Strozzio, incolumitatem modo pacti, se dediderunt." I have been thus particular, because an able author has stated that the terms of the capitulation were violated, (M'Crie's Life of Knox, p. 52,) of which I see no proof.

[2] Lesley, p. 195.

ders; and could he have succeeded in imparting a spirit of honour and unanimity to the great body of the nobility, there was little reason to be alarmed by the threatened invasion of England.

But a discovery was made in the castle which threw a gloom over all his sanguine anticipations. In the chamber of Balnaves, the agent of the Castilians, was found a register-book which contained the autograph subscriptions of two hundred Scottish noblemen and gentlemen, who had secretly bound themselves to the service of England. Amongst these were the Earls of Bothwell, Cassillis, and Marshal, with Lord Kilmaurs and Lord Gray. The noted Sir George Douglas, the brother of the Earl of Angus, had, it appeared, sent in his adherence by a secret messenger, whilst Bothwell had agreed to give up his castle of the Hermitage, and renounce all allegiance to the governor, for which service he was to receive in marriage the Duchess of Suffolk, aunt to the English monarch.[1] So much was apparent to the governor, but other disgraceful transactions were in progress of which he was ignorant. Lord Gray had not only himself forsaken his country, but was tampering with the Earls of Athole, Errol, Sutherland, and Crawford, whom he found well disposed to declare their mind, provided they were "honestly entertained." He accordingly advised that some money should be given them according to their good deserving.[2] Glencairn, at the same time, transmitted to the protector a secret overture of service, in which he declared himself ready to assist the King of England in the accomplishment of his purposes; to co-operate in the invasion with his friends and vassals, who were favourers of the Word of God; and to raise two thousand men, who should be ready either to join the army, or keep possession of Kyle, Cunningham, and Renfrew. He also gave assurances of the devotion of Cassillis and Lennox to the same cause; requested money to equip a troop of horse, with which he would hold the governor in check till Somerset's arrival; and added directions for the fortification of some "notable strengths" on the east and west Borders, by which the whole country might be commanded to the gates of Stirling. It was to be expected that such offers would be highly welcome to the English government, although distrust must have been felt in dealing with persons whose oaths had been so repeatedly and unscrupulously violated. Not a year had elapsed since all these noble barons had solemnly given their adherence to the government of Arran, most of them had been appointed members of the privy-council, they had approved in parliament of the dissolution of the marriage and peace with England,[3] and they were now prepared to change sides once more, and promote the purposes of the protector. Even after such repeated falsehood their overtures were graciously accepted, and they received a pardon for their desertion of their agreement with the late king, under condition that they should perform its conditions in every respect to his son and successor.[4] It is material to notice these terms, as they prove, on the one hand, that, under the cloak of marriage, Edward, like his father Henry, concealed a design for the subjugation of Scotland; and on the other, that the party who favoured this project were disposed to accomplish their purposes, although at the sacrifice of the independence of the country.[5]

The discovery of such intrigues

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office. Laird of Langton to the Protector Somerset, 18th August 1547.

[2] Lord Gray to the Protector Somerset, 28th August 1547. MS. Letter, State-paper Office.

[3] Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, vol. ii. p. 476. MS. Book of Privy-council, fol. 32, p. 2.

[4] MS., State-paper Office, entitled, Overture of Service and other Devices, by the Earl of Glencairn. These important facts, which are new to this portion of Scottish history, were found in the Original Letters and Overtures of the actors, preserved in the State-paper Office.

[5] Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, vol. ii. p. 476. MS. Record of Privy-council, fol. iii.

placed the governor in an embarrassing situation. To defeat machinations which had spread so widely, required a union of resolution and talent which he did not possess: he was aware that the country was on the point of being invaded by the protector in person; to have attempted to bring his enemies to justice might have thrown his preparations for resistance into confusion, and spread distrust and dismay throughout the people at a time when vigour and confidence were imperatively required. Either he ought to have pretended a total ignorance, silently taking the best measures to defeat the designs of his enemies; or he should resolutely have seized the chief conspirators; but Arran unfortunately adopted that middle course which was sure to lead to a calamitous result: he dissembled for the moment, and delayed all proceedings against the great body of his opponents, but he threw Bothwell into prison, and thus gave an opportunity to his associates of providing for their own safety.[1]

Yet in the midst of this political irresolution he was not remiss in his military preparations. A line of beacons had been established during the summer upon the hills near the coast, making a chain of communication from St Abb's Head to Linlithgow; horsemen were kept at each station to carry intelligence; and it was proclaimed that no person should leave their habitations, or remove their goods, as the governor and noblemen of Scotland had determined to repel the invaders, and defend the realm, with the help of God, and at the hazard of their lives.[2]

On the 27th of August the protector arrived with his army at Newcastle, and at the same time a fleet of thirty-four ships of war and thirty transports, commanded by Lord Clinton, anchored off that port. The English force consisted in all of fourteen thousand two hundred men, of which four thousand were men-at-arms and demi-lances, two thousand light horse, and two hundred Spanish carabineers mounted. The remaining eight thousand were footmen and pioneers.[3] This force was divided into three principal wards or battles. The vanward was led by Dudley, earl of Warwick, afterwards the noted Duke of Northumberland, a captain of great experience and resolution, who had been bred to arms in the French wars of Henry the Eighth; the main battle by the protector in person; and the rear by Lord Dacre of the North, a veteran who still possessed all the fire and vivacity of youth. Each battle was strengthened by wings of horse, consisting of men-at-arms, demi-lances, hagbutteers, and some pieces of artillery, "every piece having its guard of pioneers to clear the way."[4] Lord Grey of Wilton, high marshal of the army, commanded the cavalry, having under him Sir Francis Bryan, Sir Peter Mewtas, Sir Francis Fleming, master of the ordnance, and Don Pedro de Gamboa, who conducted a fine body of mounted Spanish carabineers.

We have seen that, during the whole of the preceding year, the Scottish governor had been engaged in war, and being apprehensive that the people, fatigued with perpetual hostilities, might be remiss in obeying his summons, he adopted an expedient for assembling an army, which was seldom used except in cases of imminent peril. He sent the fiery cross throughout the country[5]—a warlike symbol of Celtic origin, constructed of two slender rods of hazel, formed into the shape of a cross, the extremities seared in the fire and extinguished when red and blazing in the blood of a goat, slain for the occasion. From this slight description, it is evident that the custom may be traced back to pagan times; and it is certain that, throughout the Highland districts of the country, its summons, wherever

[1] MS. Accounts of Lord Treasurer, June 27, 1547.

[2] MS. Book of Privy-council, fol. 68, p. 2. Epistolæ Reg. Scot. vol. ii. p. 387.

[3] Patten in Dalyel's Fragments of Scottish History, pp. xxv., xxvi.

[4] Hayward in Kennet, vol. ii. p. 280.—Carte, vol. iii. p. 206.—Patten, p. 32.

[5] Notes and Illustrations, letter D.

it was carried, was regarded with awe, and obeyed without hesitation. Previous to this, we do not hear of its having been adopted in the Lowlands; but on the present emergency, being fastened to the point of a spear, it was transmitted by the heralds and pursuivants throughout every part of the realm; from town to town, from village to village, from hamlet to hamlet, the ensanguined symbol flew with astonishing rapidity; and such was its effect, that in a wonderfully short space of time an army of thirty-six thousand men assembled near Musselburgh.

The Duke of Somerset now entered Scotland, on the 2d of September 1547, and without interruption advanced along the coast, in sight of the English fleet, till he arrived at the defile, then called the Peaths, a deep ravine, over which at the present day is thrown the Pease Bridge.[1] It has been well described by Hayward as a "valley stretching towards the sea six miles in length, the banks of which were so steep on either side, that the passage across was not direct, but by paths leading slope-wise, which being many, the place is for that reason called the Peaths, or paths."[2] It was reported in the English host that the Scots were here prepared to resist the further advance of the English; and undoubtedly such was the advantage of the ground that, with even a small portion of military skill, a far inferior force might have discomfited their whole army; yet this opportunity was neglected—a circumstance which can only be accounted for by the fact that most of the proprietors of the country through which the enemy held their march were attached to the interests of the enemy. We know that in Henry Balnaves's register were the names of two hundred gentlemen, who were under promise to England; and when his army lay at Newcastle, the protector received a visit from the Laird of Mangertown, and forty barons of the east Borders, who tendered their services and were courteously received.[3] The little obstruction which Somerset met during the whole course of his march may be thus explained.

Having employed the greatest part of a day in conducting the army, and dragging the artillery through this rugged pass, the duke made himself master of the neighbouring castles[4] of Dunglass, Thornton, and Innerwick, and leaving Dunbar within a gunshot on his right, he pushed forward to East Linton, where the army crossed the Tyne by the narrow bridge which still remains, whilst the horsemen and carriages forded the river. Here the enemy neglected another excellent opportunity of attacking the English force when defiling across Linton Bridge. They contented themselves with pushing forward some of their prickers, or light horse, under Dandy Car, a noted Borderer, whose little squadron was put to flight by a charge led by Lord Warwick. Advancing past Hailes Castle, which opened upon them an ineffectual cannonade, they proceeded, on the 7th September, to Lang-Niddry, where they encamped for the night.[5] Here the protector, communicating by signal with his fleet, which lay near Leith, Lord Clinton the admiral came ashore; and after a conference it was resolved that the larger ships should leave the road at Leith, and cast anchor beside Musselburgh, whilst the transports and victuallers should beat in as near as possible to the shore. The English were now aware that the Scottish army lay beside Musselburgh, and during the march of the succeeding day there were generally in view some small bodies of their light cavalry, which kept galloping backwards and forwards on the eminences overhanging their line of march.

On September the 8th, the protector halted for the night, and encamped near a town called Salt Preston, now Prestonpans, within view of the enemy's camp at Edmonstone Edge, about three miles distant. On his right to the north was the Firth, and towards the south, not far distant, rose the hill of Faside. Upon

[1] Situated in the north of Berwickshire.
[2] Hayward in Kennet, vol. ii. p. 281.
[3] Patten's Expedition, p. 27.
[4] These castles were in Haddingtonshire.
[5] Patten's Expedition, p. 42.

the long elevated ridges which formed the roots of the hill the Scottish cavalry shewed themselves early next morning, and approached the English vanguard, whooping, shaking their lances, and attempting to provoke them to an onset. They formed a force of one thousand five hundred light horse, led by Lord Hume, and near them lay in ambush a body of five hundred foot. Somerset, however, from the forwardness of these prickers, suspected that they reckoned on some nearer support than was discernible, and gave strict orders to his men to preserve their ranks; but Lord Grey, impatient of such provocation, extorted leave to try the effect of a charge. Accordingly, as soon as they came, "scattered on the spur," within a stonecast of the English, and after their usual shouting, were beginning to wheel about, Grey with his demi-lances, and a thousand men-at-arms, charged them at full speed, upon which they faced about, and firmly received his onset. The weight of the men-at-arms, however, and their barbed steeds, were an overmatch for the slight, though hardy hackneys of the Borderers; and after maintaining the conflict for three hours, they were entirely broken, and the greatest part of them cut to pieces. The chase continued for three miles, from Faside hill to the right wing of their army, which lay to the south. In this unfortunate affair thirteen hundred men were slain within sight of their camp, Lord Hume was severely wounded, his son, the master of Hume, taken prisoner, and the whole body of the Scottish cavalry nearly destroyed,—a loss seriously felt in the next day's battle.[1]

After this success the protector, accompanied by a small party, descended from Faside hill, by a lane which led directly north, to the church of Inveresk. His object was to examine the position occupied by the Scots; and he was enabled to do so effectually, as the course he took ran almost parallel to their camp, which he could see distinctly. Nothing could be better chosen for strength and security than the ground whereon they lay: defended on the right by a morass which stretched towards the south, on the left by the Firth, and in front, looking eastward, by the river Esk, which took its course between them and the enemy. Over this river, to the north and near the Firth, was the bridge of Musselburgh, upon which they had placed their ordnance, so that it was evident to the English commander, upon a slight inspection, that if they chose to keep their position, it would be impossible to attack them with advantage, or bring them to a battle. Somerset, however, did not fail to observe that their camp was partially commanded by the hill of Inveresk, and by the higher parts of the lane which led from Faside hill; and having resolved to occupy these places with his ordnance, with the object of forcing them to dislodge from their strong ground, he rode back to his own camp.

On the road he was overtaken by a Scottish herald, with his tabard on, accompanied by a trumpeter, who brought a message from the governor. The herald said his first errand was for an exchange of prisoners, his second to declare that his master, eager to avoid the effusion of Christian blood, was willing to allow him to retreat without molestation, and upon honourable conditions. The trumpeter next addressed the duke, informing him that, in case such terms were not accepted, his master, the Earl of Huntly, willing to bring the quarrel to a speedy conclusion, was ready to encounter him twenty to twenty, ten to ten, or, if he would so far honour him, man to man. To these messages Somerset made a brief and temperate reply. He declared, turning to the herald, that his coming into Scotland had been at the first to seek peace, and to obtain such terms as should be for the good of either realm. His quarrel, he added, was just; he trusted, therefore, God would prosper it; and since the governor had already rejected such conditions as would never again be

[1] Patten, pp. 46, 47. Anderson's MS. History, p. 98. Hayward in Kennet, vol. ii. p. 282.

proffered, he must look now to its being decided by arms; "and as for thy master," said he, addressing the trumpeter, "he lacketh some discretion to send his challenge to one who, by reason of the weighty charge he bears, (no less than the government of a king's person and the protection of his realm,) hath no power to accept it; whilst there are yet many noble gentlemen here, his equals in rank, to whom he might have addressed his cartel, without fear of a refusal." At this moment the Earl of Warwick broke eagerly in, telling the messenger that he would not only accept the challenge, but would give him a hundred crowns if he brought back his master's consent.[1] "Nay," said Somerset, "Huntly is not equal in rank to your lordship; but, herald, tell the governor, and the Earl of Huntly also, that we have now spent some time in your country: our force is but a small company—yours far exceeds us; yet bring me word they will meet us in a plain field, and thou shalt have a thousand crowns for thy pains, and thy masters fighting enough."

The herald and his companion were then dismissed, and the protector pursued his way to the camp, where, after a consultation with his officers, it was thought proper, notwithstanding the challenge so lately given, to make a final effort to avert hostilities. A letter was accordingly addressed to the governor, in which Somerset declared his readiness to retreat from the kingdom on the single condition that the Scots would consent to keep their youthful queen in her own country, unfettered by any agreement with the French government, until she had reached a marriageable age, and was able to say for herself whether she would abide by the matrimonial treaty with England. Had such moderate and equitable proposals been made previous to the declaration of hostilities, they would probably have been accepted; but coming at so questionable a moment, they appeared to the governor to be dictated rather by a conviction in the protector, that he could no longer support his army in an enemy's country, than by any real love of peace. On shewing the letter to Hamilton, archbishop of St Andrew's, who was much in his confidence, he expressed the same opinion; and it was agreed to suppress the communication entirely, whilst a report was spread that an insulting, instead of a conciliatory message had been transmitted, requiring the Scots to deliver up their queen, and submit themselves to the mercy of their enemy.[2]

Such being the result of this last attempt, nothing was left to either party but an appeal to arms; and early on the morning of the 10th of September, the Duke of Somerset broke up his camp, and gave orders for the army to advance towards the hill of Inveresk, his design being to encamp near that spot, and to plant his ordnance on the eminence commanding the Scottish position. This movement was no sooner perceived by the Scottish governor than he embraced the extravagant idea that the protector had commenced his retreat towards his fleet, which had removed two days before from Leith, and now lay in Musselburgh bay, with the design of embarking his army. He instantly resolved to anticipate him, by throwing himself between the English and their ships; and disregarding the advice of his best officers, who earnestly recommended him to keep his strong position till, at least, the demonstrations of the enemy became more definite, he gave orders for the whole army to dislodge and pass the river.[3] Angus, who led the vanward, deeming it madness to throw away their advantage, refused to obey; but being charged on pain of treason to pass forward, he forded the river, and was followed, although after some delay, by the governor, who led the main battle, and the Earl of Huntly with his northland men, who formed the rear. The advance mustered ten thousand strong, embracing the strength of Fife, Mearns, Angus, and the West

[1] Patten, pp. 49, 50.

[2] Hayward in Kennet, vol. ii. p. 283.

[3] Maitland, vol. ii. p. 874. Hayward, 284.

Country; it was flanked on the right by some pieces of artillery drawn by men, and on the left by four hundred light horse; it included also a large body of priests and monks, who marched under a white banner, on which was painted a female kneeling before a crucifix, her hair dishevelled, and, embroidered underneath, the motto, "Afflictæ Ecclesiæ ne obliviscaris."[1]

In the main battle was the power of Lothian, Fife, Strathern, Stirlingshire, and the great body of the barons of Scotland, having on the right wing the Earl of Argyle, with four thousand West Highlanders, and on the left the Islesmen, with Macleod, Macgregor, and other chieftains.[2] It was defended also on both flanks by some pieces of artillery, as was likewise the rear, but the guns were clumsily worked, and seem to have done little execution; whilst the Scots, though greatly superior in number, were inferior in military strength, from their having neither hagbutteers nor men-at-arms.

This movement of the Scots, in abandoning their advantage and crossing the river, was viewed with equal astonishment and pleasure by the English commander. He had dislodged from his camp, and commenced his march at eight in the morning; and before he was half way to Inversk, the enemy, having surmounted the hill, were seen advancing towards the English. Somerset and the Earl of Warwick, who happened to be riding together at this moment, instantly perceived their advantage, thanked God for the fortunate event, ordered forward their artillery, and taking a joyful leave of each other, proceeded to their respective charges; the former to the vanward, and the duke to the main battle, where was the king's standard.[3] Warwick immediately arranged his division upon the side of the hill; the protector formed his battle chiefly on the hill, but his extreme right rested on the plain; the rear, under Lord Dacre, was drawn up wholly on the plain; whilst Lord Grey, with the men-at-arms and the mounted carabineers, were stationed at some distance on the extreme left. His orders were to take the enemy in flank, yet he was strictly interdicted from making any attack till the foot of the vanward were engaged with the enemy, and the main battle was near at hand for his support. By the time these arrangements were completed the Scots were considerably advanced, their object being to throw themselves between the English and their fleet; but in accomplishing this the wing of their rearward, which moved nearest to the Firth, found themselves exposed to the fire of one of the English galleys, which galled them severely, slew the Master of Graham, with some others who were beside him, and threw Argyle's Highlandmen into disorder.[4] Checked in this manner, their army fell back from the ground which was thus exposed, and declining to the southward, took a direct line towards the west end of Faside hill.[5] Their object was to win the side of the hill, and, availing themselves of the advantage, to attack the enemy from the higher ground; but as soon as the protector perceived this movement, he commanded Lord Grey and Sir Ralph Vane, with the veteran bands of the men-at-arms, called Bulleners,[6] and the demi-lances under Lord Fitzwaters, to charge the right wing of the Scots, and if they could not break it, at least to keep it in check till their own vanward might advance further on the hill, and their centre and rear coming up, form a full front against the enemy. This manœuvre, although aware of its perilous nature, was executed by Lord Grey with the utmost readiness and gallantry. Observing the Scottish infantry advanc-

[1] Hayward in Kennet, vol. ii. p. 286. Anderson's MS. History, vol. ii. p. 101.
[2] Pitscottie by Dalyel, vol. ii. p. 496.
[3] Hayward in Kennet, vol. ii. p. 284.
[4] This fact is stated both in the English and Scottish accounts of the battle, but in walking over the field I found it extremely difficult to account for it.—See Patten, p. 55.
[5] Ibid.
[6] From their having been employed as the garrison at Boulogne.

ing at so round a pace, that many deemed them to be rather cavalry than foot,[1] he waited for a short space, till Lord Warwick was pretty well up with the enemy, and then, commanding the trumpets to sound, charged down the hill at full gallop, right against the left wing of Angus's division. The shock at first was dreadful, but the superiority of infantry over cavalry was soon evinced. The Scottish foot were armed with spears eighteen feet in length, far exceeding that of the lances of the men-at-arms, and they knew well how to avail themselves of this advantage. Angus, on observing the intention of the English, had commanded his men to form in that formidable order which had often effectually resisted the chivalry of England. Nothing could be more simple, but nothing more effective: the soldiers closed inwards, so near as to appear locked together shoulder to shoulder; the front line stooped low and almost knelt, placing the butt-end of their pike against the right foot, grasping it firmly with both hands, and inclining its steel point breast-high against the enemy; the second rank crossed their pikes over their shoulders; the third assumed the same position, and so on to whatever depth the column might be, giving it the appearance of a gigantic hedge-hog covered with an impenetrable skin of steel bristles.[2] Against such a body, if the men stood firm, the finest cavalry in the world could not make any serious impression. It happened, also, that a broad muddy ditch or slough lay between the English and the Scottish foot, into which the horses plunged up to the counter, and with great difficulty cleared it. Yet, undismayed by these adverse circumstances, Lord Grey, heading his men-at-arms, struggled through, and with his front companies charged full upon the enemy's left. No human force, however, could break the wall against which he had thrown himself; and in an incredibly short time two hundred saddles were emptied, the horses being stabbed in the belly with the spears, and the riders who had fallen speedily despatched by the *whingers*, or short double-edged daggers, which the Scots carried at their girdle. Such was the fate of Shelly, Ratcliff, Clarence, Preston, and other brave and veteran commanders of the Bulleners. Flammock, who carried the English standard, saved the colours, but left the staff in the hands of the enemy.[3] Lord Grey himself was dangerously hurt in the mouth and neck. Many horses, furious from their wounds, and plunging in their agony, carried disorder into their own companies; and such was soon the inextricable confusion into which the whole body of the men-at-arms was thrown, that a portion of them, breaking away, fled through the ranks of their own division, whilst Lord Grey had the greatest difficulty in extricating the rest, and retreating up the hill with their shattered and wounded remains. At this critical moment, had Angus been supported by the rest of the army, or had the Scots possessed any body of men-at-arms, who by a timely charge might have improved their advantage, the English would in all probability have been undone.[4] But the cavalry had been nearly cut to pieces in the action of the day before, and the centre and rear, under the governor and Huntly, were still at a considerable distance; the vanward, therefore, unable to pursue the fugitives, and not choosing to advance against the main body of the enemy till certain of support, halted for a brief space. The opportunity was thus lost, and the Earl of Warwick, aware of the infinite value of a few minutes gained at such a juncture, galloped through the wavering ranks of the advance, re-established their order, disengaged the men-at-arms from the infantry, and rallying them, with the assistance of Sir Ralph Sadler, pushed forward the company of the Spanish carabin-

1 Patten, p. 56.

2 So that it were as easy, to use the words of an eye-witness, for a bare finger to pierce the skin of an angry hedge-hog, as for any one to encounter the brunt of their pikes.—Patten, p. 59.

3 Lord Herries' Memoirs, p. 20.

4 Hayward in Kennet, vol. ii. p. 284. Patten, pp. 61, 62, 65.

eers. These fine troops, armed both man and horse in complete mail, galloped up to the brink of the broad ditch, and, coming within half-musket range, discharged their pieces full in the faces of the Scottish infantry.[1] This attack was seconded by Sir Peter Mewtas, who brought up his foot hagbutteers: the archers, now moving rapidly forward, discharged a flight of arrows; and at the same moment the artillery, which had been judiciously placed on the hill, were made to bear upon Angus's division, who, dreading the effect of so complicated an attack, began to fall back, though in good order, to the main battle. At this instant the Highlanders, who, unable to resist their plundering propensities, were dispersed over the field stripping the slain, mistook this retrograde movement for a flight, and seized with a sudden panic, began to run off in all directions. Their terror communicated itself to the burgh troops: these formed a main portion of the centre, and, starting from their ranks, although still a quarter of a mile distant from the enemy, they threw away their weapons and followed the Highlanders. In the midst of this shameful confusion the governor, instead of exerting himself to rally the fugitives, shouted "Treason," a cry which only increased the disorder. The Earl of Warwick meanwhile was coming fast forward, the horsemen once more shewed themselves ready to charge, and the English centre and rear hastened on at an accelerated pace. Had the Scottish vanward been certain that support was near at hand, they might, even alone, have withstood this formidable attack; but, deserted by the rest of the army, they did not choose to sacrifice themselves; and the body which so lately had opposed an impenetrable front to the enemy beginning first to undulate to and fro, like a steely sea agitated by the wind, after a few moments was seen breaking into a thousand fragments and dispersing in all directions. Everything was now lost: the ground over which the flight lay was as thickly strewed with pikes as a floor with rushes; helmets, bucklers, swords, daggers, and steel caps, lay scattered on every side, cast away by their owners, as impeding their speed; and the chase, beginning at one o'clock, continued till six in the evening with extraordinary slaughter. The English demi-lances and men-at-arms, irritated by their late defeat, hastened after the fugitives with a speed heightened by revenge,[2] and passing across the field of their late action, were doubly exasperated by seeing the bodies of their brave companions, stript by the Highlanders, lying all naked and mangled before their eyes. Crying to one another to remember Peniel Heugh, the spot where Sir Ralph Eure and his company had, in a former year,[3] been cut to pieces by the Earl of Angus, they spurred at the top of their speed after the fugitives, cutting them down on all sides, and admitting none to quarter but those from whom they hoped for a heavy ransom. The Scots fled in three several ways—some straight upon Edinburgh, some along the coast to Leith, but the most part towards Dalkeith—with the object of throwing the morass, which had defended the right of their camp, between them and their pursuers.[4] Yet this proved so ineffectual a security, that, before the chase was ended, fourteen thousand were slain, the river running red with blood, and the ground for five miles in distance and four in breadth being covered, says an eye-witness, as thick with dead bodies as cattle in a well-stocked pasture field.[5] It was recorded, that in Edinburgh alone this day's battle made three hundred and sixty widows.[6] Little pity was shewn to the priests, multitudes of whom were slain,[7] and found mingled amongst the dead bodies of the common soldiers, whilst their sacred banner lay trampled under foot and soiled with blood.

The evening was now advancing to night, the pursuit had lasted for five

[1] Patten, p. 65. Holinshed, p. 239.

[2] Patten, p. 66.
[3] In 1554. Supra, p. 29.
[4] Patten, p. 66. [5] Ibid. p. 67.
[6] Herries' Memoirs, p. 21.
[7] Patten, p. 72.

hours, and the protector causing a retreat to be sounded, the army mustered again on the ridge of Edmonstone Edge, beside the Scottish tents, where, joyous at their victory, they gave a long loud shout, which, as they afterwards were told, was so shrill and piercing, that it was heard in the streets of the capital.[1]

This great defeat, named from the adjoining fields the battle of Pinkie, if immediately followed up by Somerset, might have led to results most fatal to Scotland. Had he pursued the fugitive governor to Stirling, where the young queen was kept; made himself master of its castle, which could not have held out long against such a force as he commanded; occupied Edinburgh, seized and fortified the town and harbour of Leith, and after leaving a garrison to defend it, taken his progress through the country, and offered a general protection to the Scots, the consequences must have been eminently hazardous. But providentially for Scotland, the protector at this moment received information of secret plots against him in England; and he resolved to hurry home, that he might confront and defeat his enemies. His measures, in consequence of this abrupt decision, were confused and ill-digested. Their cruelty alienated the minds of the people, and their impolicy shook the confidence of the Scottish barons who were attached to his service. Advancing from Edgebuckling Brae[1] where he had encamped after the battle, to Leith, he quartered his horse in the town; ravaged the neighbouring country; received the submission of the Earl of Bothwell, whom the governor had released from prison;[2] burnt Kinghorn, with some petty fishing ports upon the coast of Fife, and garrisoned a deserted monastery upon Inchcolm, a small island in the Firth. He next spoiled the abbey of Holyrood, from which he tore off the leaden roof; set fire to Leith; and having remained no longer than a week, commenced his retreat on the 18th September 1547.[3] The fleet at the same time weighed anchor, and in their passage homeward took possession of the strong castle of Broughty, situated at the mouth of the Tay, which, by the treachery of Lord Gray, its owner, was, on the first summons, delivered to the enemy.[4] It was newly fortified and garrisoned, after which Clinton returned with his navy to England. During the retreat of Somerset through the Merse and Teviotdale he received the submission of the chief men of these districts, who swore fealty to King Edward, and surrendered their castles to the protector. Amongst these were the Lairds of Cessford, Ferniehirst, Ormiston, Mellerstain, and many others. He then seized and garrisoned the strong castle of Hume, and repaired Roxburgh, building a new fort upon the site of the old castle. For the speedy completion of this he was so earnest, that he put his own hand to the spade and shovel, encouraging his lords and officers to the like exertions, so that within a few days it was ready to receive a garrison.[5]

While still at this place intelligence reached the army of the success of the Earl of Lennox and Lord Wharton, who, two days before the battle, had entered Scotland by the west marches at the head of a body of five thousand men. The object was to create a diversion in these parts, and prevent them from sending their force to join the main army of Scotland. In this inroad they took Castlemilk, giving it in charge to Sir Edward Dudley; wasted the country with fire and sword; and razed to the ground the town of Annan, blowing up the church and steeple, where a brave officer named Lyon, with the Master of Maxwell and the Lairds of Johnston and Cockpool, made a desperate defence,

[1] Patten, p. 71.
[2] Anderson, MS. Hist., vol. ii. p. 106.
[3] Lesley, Hist., pp. 200, 201. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 45.
[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office. Lord Clinton, Andrew Dudley, &c., to the Lord Protector, 24th Sept. 1547.
[5] Anderson, MS. Hist., vol. ii. pp. 106, 107. Stevenson's Illustrations of the Reign of Queen Mary. Sir E. Dudley to the Earl of Shrewsbury, 11th Sept. 1547-8, p. 24.

and were permitted to retire with their lives.[1] In consequence of this success the whole of Annandale was struck with such terror, that it submitted to England, the Borderers swearing allegiance to Edward, and giving pledges for their fidelity.[2] Of these advantages, however, Somerset neglected to avail himself; and whilst such was his impolitic conduct, the measures on the part of the Scots, who still remained true to their allegiance, were prompt and decisive. The cruelty of the slaughter at Pinkie, and the subsequent severities at Leith, excited universal indignation; and the idea that a free country was to be compelled into a pacific matrimonial alliance, amid the groans of its dying citizens and the flames of its seaports, was revolting and absurd. The queen-mother, a woman of much spirit and political talent, seized the opportunity to infuse vigour and decision into the national councils. Meeting the governor, who immediately after his defeat had hurried to Stirling, she assembled the nobility around her, and proposed that a new army should be levied, whilst ambassadors should be despatched to France with a request for instant assistance. As the enemy still occupied Leith, the infant queen, for the sake of security, was conveyed from Stirling to the monastery of Inchmahome, situated in a little island in the lake of Menteith, where she remained with her governors, Lords Erskine and Livingston, till the retreat of the protector.[3] Immediately after that event, however, a council was held by the governor and the queen-dowager at Stirling, in which it was determined, that as the education of the young queen could not be conducted with any safety or advantage in a country exposed to daily war, she should be sent to the court of France. D'Osell, the French ambassador, assured the nobility that no more likely method could be adopted to secure the speedy assistance of his master; and finding the proposal agreeable to them, the queen-mother suggested that the French dauphin, under the circumstances in which the kingdom was now placed, would be an infinitely more appropriate match for their queen, when she arrived at a marriageable age, than the English monarch, whose hand had been so rudely forced upon her. This scheme could not fail to be disagreeable to Arran the governor, who had designed her for his own son; but his influence was on the wane; and although nothing definitive was settled, the ambassadors to the French court were permitted to sound the inclinations of Henry the Second, who eagerly embraced the overture.[4]

Although the resolute measures adopted by the queen-dowager, and the retreat of Somerset, supported in some degree the spirit of the country, it was scarcely to be expected that, under the circumstances in which Scotland stood, the struggle against England could be much longer continued. The land was shamefully deserted by the greater part of its nobility.[5] The Earls of Angus, Glencairn, Cassillis, and Lennox; the Lords Maxwell, Boyd, Gray, and Cranston; the Lairds of Ormiston and Brunston, with many other barons, had entered the service of England, given hostages for their fidelity, and sworn to secret articles which bound them to obey the orders of the protector.[6] On the side of the queen, indeed, Argyle, at this time one of the most powerful barons in Scotland, had advanced (January 1547-8) at the head of a large force to Dundee, with the determination of

[1] Anderson, MS. Hist., vol. ii. p. 111. MS. Letter, State-paper Office. The Earl of Lennox and Lord Wharton to the Protector, Carlisle, Sept. 16, 1547.

[2] Anderson, MS. Hist., p. 111.

[3] Lesley, Bannatyne edit. p. 200.

[4] Lesley, p. 204. MS. Letter, B. C. State-paper Office, Glencairn to the Protector, 23d Oct. 1547. Also, MS. Letter, Lord Grey to the Protector, with the enclosure, 31st Oct. 1547. Same to the same, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 16th Nov. 1547. MS. Letter, B. C., Grey to the Protector, with news from Scotland, 24th Nov. 1547.

[5] See Notes and Illustrations, letter E.

[6] Lord Grey to the Protector, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 20th Oct. 1547; also MS. Letter, B. C. Glencairn to Lord Wharton, 23d Oct. 1547; also MS. Letter, 3d Oct. 1547, Kirkpatrick of Closeburn to Lord Wharton, State-paper Office B. C.: also MS. Letter, 18th Oct. 1547, Grey to the Protector, State-paper Office, B. C.

making himself master of Broughty castle, and compelling the English to abandon that part of the country.[1] A seasonable bribe, however, of one thousand crowns caused an immediate and discreditable change of purpose; and, imitating the example of his brethren, he embraced the service of England and retired from Dundee,[2] (5th February 1547-8.) Bothwell, whose power was great upon the marches, vacillated alternately between the one party and the other; Huntly, the main stay of the Catholics, who had been taken prisoner at Pinkie, was allowed to proceed to Newcastle on a solemn engagement to further the views of Edward. Lord Maxwell, another of the prisoners, unscrupulously imitated his example; and Sir George Douglas, the ablest and most unprincipled of the party, not only signed the secret articles, but communicated a plan for an invasion, by which the whole country might be brought in a short time under the subjection of England.[3] With such men, however, no promises or oaths were held sacred; and, extraordinary as it may appear, to those barons who had selfishly and basely engaged with the enemy, Scotland at this time owed her preservation. On the 18th of February 1547-8, Lord Wharton assembled the power of the western marches; he was joined by the Earl of Lennox, who commanded the Scottish Borderers in the service of England; and, according to their agreement, he expected to be strengthened by the whole power of the Douglases, and the Master of Maxwell, who held the chief command in these parts. Maxwell, however, after having given pledges to England, was bribed to desert his agreement, by a promise that he should marry the heiress of Terregles, a rich ward of the governor's; and Angus, notwithstanding his near connexion with Lennox, deserted him. On his advance Wharton found in his allies, to use his own expressive phrase, "an accustomed fashion of untruth." The Scottish earl made his appearance, but afterwards escaped to his own men; and, enraged at this breach of promise, Wharton determined to waste the country and take vengeance on such treachery. Incautiously dividing his little army, which consisted of three thousand men, he sent forward the cavalry under his son Henry, and himself followed with the foot. But scarce had he proceeded a few miles through a wild and wasted country, when he was attacked and entirely routed by the Earl of Angus.[4] The Scottish lord had first dispersed the party in advance; and the "assured"[5] Scots under the Master of Maxwell, who composed a considerable portion of the English force, no sooner saw the day likely to turn against their employers, than following the example shewn at Ancrum, they tore away their red crosses and slaughtered their allies without honour or mercy.[6] Yet, although successful, it was a dear-bought victory to the Scots, six hundred being slain or drowned in the river Nith, and many of the principal barons made prisoners in a charge of cavalry, which checked the triumph of the enemy, though it could not restore the day. Wharton, after making extraordinary

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Sir And. Dudley to the Protector, 27th Dec. 1547.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 5th Feb. 1547-8. Sir And. Dudley to the Protector. Ibid. Lord Gray of Scotland to the Protector, 7th Feb. 1547-8. The first being a receipt of Grey for a thousand crowns to be paid to Argyle; the second stating "that Argyle's mind is wonderfully given to further the king's godly purpose." MS. Letter, Feb. 15, 1547-8. Thomas Wharton to the Protector, State-paper Office, B. C.

[3] Grey to the Protector, 20th Oct. 1547, MS. Letter, State-paper Office. MS. Letter, 21st Nov. 1547, Lord Grey to the Protector. MS. Letter, 31st Oct. 1547, Lord Grey to the Protector; also 24th Nov. 1547, Lord Grey to the Protector; also, 20th March 1547-8, Lord Huntly to the Protector; also, Grey to the Protector, 20th Oct. 1547; also, B. C., 15th Nov. 1547, Lord Wharton to the Protector.

[4] MS. Letter, 15th Nov. 1547, State-paper Office, B. C., Lord Wharton to the Protector. Ibid., 18th Feb. 1547-8, the same to the Protector. MS. Letter, Ibid., Lord Wharton to the Protector, Lochmaben, 21st Feb. 1547-8. Ibid., B. C. MS. Letter, 23d February 1547-8. Thomas Wharton to the Protector.

[5] The assured Scots were those who had entered into bands or covenants with England.

[6] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B. C., 23d February, 1547-8, Carlisle. Thomas Wharton to the Protector.

efforts, by which he extricated himself from his perilous embarrassment, retreated with the remnant of his force to Carlisle,[1] and Lord Grey, who at the same time had pushed forward to Haddington, was compelled by the news of this severe reverse to retire to Berwick. He had been joined by the Lairds of Ormiston, Brunston, and many of the barons of Lothian, to the number of one thousand horse; their houses, on his precipitate retreat, were sacked by the governor; and in one noted instance Arran hanged every man in the garrison which held out against him.[2] This impolitic cruelty drew after it a stern and terrible retaliation. Pledges, as we have seen, had been given by the Scots in the English service as hostages for their fidelity, and amongst these were many young and noble youths. Lord Wharton, smarting under his defeat, and exasperated by the desertion of Maxwell and the assured Scots, held a court for the trial of the pledges, at the "Moot Hill," beside Carlisle, and condemned ten to be hanged: four of these were instantly executed, amidst the tears and lamentations of their friends, who vainly implored delay; six were respited, whilst some priests and friars, who had been caught in the Scottish army, were dragged along with halters round their necks, and threatened to be tied up to the nearest trees.[3]

In the midst of these difficulties, when the governor, despairing of foreign assistance, was about to give up the contest, the conduct of the queen-mother deserved much praise. Upon the retreat of the protector, she brought back the young queen from the monastery of Inchmahome to the castle of Dumbarton, and took immediate steps for transporting her into France.[4]

Alarmed by so decisive a measure, the protector determined to make an attempt at conciliation, and some months after his retreat addressed a manifesto to the governor,[5] in which he disclaimed all views of subjugating the realm, or subverting the government of Scotland. His only object, he declared, was, by marriage, to unite the two kingdoms upon a footing of perfect equality; and he desired that the names of England and Scotland, which had for so many centuries been arrayed in mortal hostility against each other, should henceforth be sunk under the common appellation of Britain.[6] These advances, however, came too late; and having been disregarded by the governor, Lord Grey, at the head of a powerful force, once more entered the country; carried his ravages through the Merse and Mid-Lothian up to the gates of the capital; razed Dalkeith and Musselburgh; took and fortified Lauder and Haddington; and after leaving in the last place a strong garrison, returned to England.[7] This expedition was rendered remarkable by the taking of the castle of Dalkeith, the stronghold of the crafty and able leader, George Douglas; who, after his old fashion, represented himself as favourably inclined to England. In accomplishing his purpose the English commander imitated his own cunning. "I pretended no manner of enmity against him," (I use his own words, in a letter to the protector,) "but that still I had hope of his conversion, to breed in him such trust, that the less doubting, the sooner I might be revenged or get him into my hands." Trusting to these assurances, the Scottish baron lay secure, as he believed,

[1] Earl of Lennox and Lord Wharton to the Protector, 25th February 1547-8. MS. Letter, State-paper Office.

[2] MS. Letter, Grey to the Protector, 23d Feb. 1547-8, State-paper Office; also 27th Feb. 1547-8, Grey to the Protector, State-paper Office; and same to the same, 1st March 1547-8, State-paper Office.

[3] MS. Letter, Lennox and Wharton to the Protector, 25th Feb. 1547-8, State-paper Office; also Wharton to the Protector, 18th March 1547-8, State-paper Office, B. C.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B. C. 27th Feb. 1547-8, Lord Grey to the Protector. Ibid., 4th March 1547-8, a Scottish Spy to Lord Wharton.

[5] Dated February 5, 1547-8.

[6] Carte, vol. iii. p. 222.

[7] Diurnal of Occurrents, pp. 46, 47. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Grey to the Protector, 23d April 1548. Also, MS. Letter, same to same, 12th June 1548. Ibid.

in his castle; whilst Gamboa, a Spanish leader in the service of England, and sixty mounted hagbutteers, scoured and burnt the country in his neighbourhood; but before the least intelligence could reach him, Captain Wilford, with six hundred foot and one hundred horse, had crossed the Esk, and pushing forward his advance, summoned the castle. Even then Douglas boldly encountered him at the head of his pikemen. By superiority of numbers, however, he was driven back through a postern. The English gained the base court after a desperate struggle, in which forty of the Scots were slain; and Wilford was proceeding to undermine and blow up the walls, when the garrison yielded without conditions. Much wealth was found in the place, as, according to Grey's account, "all the country had brought their goods together, thinking that nothing could prevail against George's policy."[1] He himself escaped; but his wife, his eldest son, the Master of Morton, afterwards regent, the Abbot of Arbroath, a natural son of Angus, Home, the laird of Wedderburn, and many of the Douglases, fell into the hands of the enemy. To be thus overreached and entrapped in his own devices was peculiarly mortifying to this long-practised intriguer, and seems to have sunk deeper into his spirit than the loss either of his wife or his castle.

Meanwhile the governor had been repulsed in an attempt against Broughty fort; and the chief citizens of Dundee, amongst whom the doctrines of the Reformation were making great progress, declared for England.[2] Many of the leading Scottish barons had already, as we have seen, signed articles of submission to the protector;[3] and so successful was Wharton, that six thousand men had bound themselves 'to join his force, giving hostages for their fidelity.[4] Under these circumstances, we can scarcely be surprised that the people, worn out by the continuance of war, and the ravages of the plague which now desolated the country, were on the point of falling into despair. At such a time, therefore, it was with no ordinary feelings upon the part not only of the queen-mother and her friends, but of the nation, that a French fleet was seen to enter the Firth, and an army of six thousand foreign troops soon after disembarked at Leith (16th June.)[5] It was commanded by Andrew de Montalembert Sieur D'Essé, an experienced officer; and, besides an excellent train of artillery, included three thousand Germans under the Rhinegrave, and a body of Italians led by the two Strozzi's, Leo, prior of Capua, and Peter, his brother, captain-general of the galleys. Arran instantly joined them with a force of five thousand men; and after a few days spent in consultation, the united armies invested Haddington, whilst a parliament assembled (17th July) in the abbey beside the town.[6] At this meeting of the three estates, Monsieur D'Essé brought from his royal master an affectionate assurance of his anxiety to assist his allies in defence of their independence against, what he termed, the cruelty and arrogance of England. He declared he was ready, in addition to the army now sent, to grant them every further aid that might be necessary, in troops, money, and arms; and he concluded by expressing the anxiety of the French monarch that the league, which for so many centuries had bound the nations to each other, should now be further strengthened by a marriage between his son, the dauphin, and their youthful queen,[7] whose education, if they would commit her to his

[1] MS. Letter, Grey to the Lord Protector. State-paper Office, June 4, 1548.

[2] They offered to hold their town against all the efforts of the governor, and, in return, requested some good preacher to be sent them, with a supply of English bibles and other godly books. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Dudley to the Protector, Nov. 1, 1547.

[3] Lord Grey to the Protector, 20th October 1547. State-paper Office.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B. C., Wharton to the Protector, Carlisle, November 12, 1547.

[5] De Thou, book v. p. 250. See Notes and Illustrations, letter F.

[6] Lesley, pp. 207-209. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Grey to the Protector, June 19, 1548. Ibid., July 14, 1548, Lord Wharton to the Protector.

[7] Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, vol. ii. pp. 481, 482.

charge, he would superintend with the utmost care and affection. To these proposals the Scottish parliament unanimously agreed, under the single condition that the French monarch should solemnly promise to preserve the laws and liberties of the realm of Scotland as they had existed under the race of her own kings. Measures were immediately adopted for the passage of the infant queen to France; and as it was known that the protector, aware of the design, had sent Clinton with a fleet to intercept her, great caution was used in the preparations.

Monsieur Villegagnon, with four galleys, weighing anchor from Leith, pretended to sail for France, but on clearing the mouth of the Firth, he changed his course, and passing through the Pentland Firth round Scotland, came before Dumbarton,[1] where the queen awaited his arrival. Mary, who was now a beautiful infant in her sixth year, was delivered by her mother to Monsieur de Brézé, who conveyed her on board the royal galley.[2] She was accompanied by her governors, the Lords Erskine and Livingston, and by the Lord James, her natural brother, afterwards the regent Moray, then a youth in his seventeenth year; whilst along with her embarked her four Marys, children of a like name and age with herself, selected as her playmates from the families of Fleming, Beaton, Seton, and Livingston.[3] Scarce had she embarked when the English admiral, with his fleet, was seen off St Abb's Head; but setting sail about the 7th of August, the little squadron with its royal freight escaped every danger, and cast anchor in the harbour of Brest on the 13th of August 1548. From this place the young queen took her progress to the palace of St Germain, where she was joyfully received by the French monarch, and an honourable court and household appointed for her at the public expense.[3] Having completed these arrangements, Henry directed his ambassador, Monsieur de Selves, to inform the protector and his council that, as father of the dauphin, the affianced husband of the Scottish queen, and to whom the estates of her realm had already given the investiture of the kingdom, he had taken Scotland under his protection, and considered it as included in the peace between France and England. He required him, therefore, to abstain from all hostilities against that country, and promised that a like cessation should be observed by the Scots.[4]

It was not to be expected that this intimation should produce any effect, and the war continued with equal animosity as before; but at first the success was on the side of England. Haddington held out against every effort of the foreign troops; and although a body of one thousand five hundred English horse, who escorted a supply of ammunition, were defeated with great slaughter, such was the bravery of the garrison under Sir James Wilford, that the siege was first turned into a blockade, and afterwards abandoned on the approach of the Earl of Shrewsbury at the head of an army of twenty-two thousand men. To co-operate with the land troops, a fleet under Lord Clinton appeared in the Firth, and making a descent at St Monans, on the coast of Fife, were encountered and defeated with great slaughter by the Laird of Wemyss, assisted by the Lord James,[5] who, on the first intelligence of danger, had mustered the strength of Fife, and here first gave a proof of that cool and determined character which afterwards raised him to such a height of power.[6] To balance this success, however, Haddington was fully supplied, and its garrison strengthened by four

1 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 29th July 1548, Brende to the Protector. Lesley, p. 209, Bannatyne edit. Lord Herries' Memoirs, p. 23.

2 See Notes and Illustrations, letter G.

3 Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 47. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Grey to the Protector, 4th August 1548.

4 Lesley, p. 210.

5 Memoires D'Estat, par Ribier, vol. ii. p. 152. Carte, vol. iii. p. 223.

6 Lord Herries' Memoirs, p. 24. Carte, vol. iii. p. 223.

7 Anderson's MS. History, vol. ii. p. 122, 1730.

hundred horse; Dunbar was burnt, Dundee taken, a strong fort raised at Broughty,[1] which overawed the country, another begun at Dunglas, and a force of three thousand German troops encamped in the neighbourhood to complete the work, and reduce that district.[2]

On the retreat, however, of Shrewsbury to England, affairs began to assume a different aspect, and the tide of success soon turned completely in favour of the Scots and their foreign allies. The war, too, assumed a character of more than common ferocity.[3] The Scots, not contented with the slaughter of the captives who fell into their hands, purchased their English prisoners from the French, that they might have the gratification of subjecting them to the most ingenious and protracted kinds of death. Of such excesses, disgraceful as they undoubtedly were, the causes were to be found in the conduct of the English themselves. The cruel slaughter at Pinkie,[4] the burning their seaports and shipping, the destruction of their harvest, and the pitiless severity with which the repeated invasions of the country had been accompanied, had at length animated the Scots with a universal feeling of revenge, which manifested itself in the most shocking excesses; one example of such scenes may be given as illustrating the times. Ferniehirst castle, on the east Borders, had submitted to the English; it was strongly garrisoned, and the commandant and his soldiers had made themselves obnoxious to the common people by many shameful excesses of rapine and licentiousness. Siege was laid to it by the Scottish and foreign troops; the base court was gained, the English archers were driven by the fire of the hagbutteers into the keep, and the engineers had effected a breach in the inner wall, when the commander, afraid of falling into the hands of the Scots, stole forth, and surrendered to the Sieur D'Essé, imploring his protection; but it was in vain: a Borderer beholding in him the brutal ravisher of his wife, broke through every impediment, and, ere his arm could be arrested, at one blow carried his head four paces from his body.[5]

The English had repaired and garrisoned the ruinous fortress of Roxburgh immediately subsequent to the battle of Pinkie; the chiefs on the east Border had sworn allegiance to the protector, and the west Borderers submitted universally to Lord Wharton; but the submission which had been extorted by fear was, on the first success of the foreign troops, exchanged for the bitterest hostility; and in a short space of time the country which had been occupied by the enemy was wrested from their hands. The castle of Hume was re-taken; the governor of Haddington, Sir James Wilford, made prisoner, and the party he commanded entirely defeated; the German garrison, which had been left in Coldingham, were cut to pieces; the enemy expelled from their fortifications in Inchkeith; the important strength of Fast castle recovered by stratagem; and the English at length compelled to abandon Haddington, the defence of which had cost them so much blood and treasure.[6] But the employment of foreign troops generally brings some calamity along with it: if successful, they insist on a monopoly of the glory; if defeated, they throw the blame upon their employers, and in either case jealousy and heartburnings arise. These causes seem to have operated to their full extent during the campaigns of the French in Scotland, and at last broke out in a tumult in the capital, which was only appeased after the death of the Laird of Stenhouse, the provost, and the slaughter of many of the citizens.[7]

In the course of these transactions a reinforcement of a thousand foot and three hundred horse arrived from France,[8] under the command of De

[1] It was called the Brakehill, MS. Privy-seal, 1548-9, February 3.

[2] Lesley, pp. 211, 212, 214-16. Carte, vol. iii. pp. 222, 223.

[3] Notes and Illustrations, letter H.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 19th Oct. 550. Mason to the Privy-council.

[5] Lesley, p. 224.

[6] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 49. Lesley, pp. 231, 232.

[7] Lesley, pp. 217, 218.

[8] June 23, 1549.

Thermes, an experienced officer, who prosecuted the war with such vigour and ability that the English were everywhere defeated, and compelled at last to surrender the castle of Broughty, their strongest remaining fortress in Scotland.[1] Having obtained this advantage, the governor laid siege to Lauder, and in a successful attack had already driven the enemy into the inner court, when intelligence was brought that peace had been concluded at Boulogne between France and England, upon which hostilities were immediately suspended.[2] It was found that the French monarch had stipulated very favourable terms for his allies. The English agreed to evacuate Scotland;[3] to demolish the forts which they had raised at Dunglas, Roxburgh, and Eyemouth; to surrender Lauder; and to abstain from any invasion, unless upon some new provocation.[4] To these conditions the governor lost no time in giving in his adherence, sending the Master of Erskine as his ambassador into France for that purpose,[5] and peace was proclaimed at Edinburgh in the month of April 1550.[6]

Thus after a war of nine years were the English obliged to abandon their extravagant projects of compelling the Scots, by force of arms, into a matrimonial alliance. Had their measures been more judicious, and the mode of courtship less boisterous, the match, under due restrictions, might have proved acceptable to the governor, the nobles, and the common people; but the violence of the protector defeated his object, threw his enemy into the arms of France, and rendered the breach between the two nations still wider than before.

To the queen-mother nothing could be more acceptable than this successful termination of hostilities. The betrothing of the infant queen to the dauphin, the brilliant successes of the foreign troops, and the terms of the peace, established the ascendancy of the French interest, and gave Henry the Second an influence in the management of Scottish affairs, of which she now resolved to avail herself. She had long been dissatisfied with the conduct of the governor; and, instigated alike by her own ambition and the advice of her brothers, the Duke of Guise and the Cardinal Lorraine, she formed the bold design of supplanting him in the possession of the supreme power. To accomplish this by force was impossible. Towards the conclusion of the war the people and the nobles had become jealous of the French auxiliaries;[7] the feeling was increased by the obligations which they owed to them, and the slightest appearance of compulsion employed towards Arran would have roused a spirit of universal opposition. Mary of Guise determined to gain her purpose by the more artful weapons of intrigue and bribery: she knew the venality of the Scottish nobles, she was familiar with the timid and irresolute character of the governor, and she did not despair so to manage matters that he should at length be reduced to save himself from increasing unpopularity by a voluntary demission of the regency.

Her first step towards the prosecution of these views was to repair to the court of France: her ostensible object being a visit to her daughter; her real purpose to obtain the advice and co-operation of the French monarch.[8] In the month of September, Strozzi, prior of Capua, brought a small squadron of French ships to anchor at Newhaven,[9] and the queen-

[1] Lesley, pp. 227, 228, 231.
[2] Ibid., p. 232. [3] Ibid.
[4] MS. Book of Privy-council, fol. 5, p. 1.
[5] Ibid., fol. 4, p. 2.
[6] Ibid. Proclamatio Pacis, 20th April 1550.

[7] Illustrations of the Reign of Queen Mary, pp. 30, 31. Thomas Fisher to the Protector, Oct. 11, 1548. Some minute and interesting particulars of the war in Scotland, and the conduct of the French auxiliaries under D'Essé and De Thermes, will be found in the above valuable volume of original letters (the contribution of Mr Kirkman Finlay to the Maitland Club.) See also in the same volume, p. 36, Letter from Sir Thomas Holcroft to the Lord Protector Somerset, 24th July 1549, pp. 36, 39; also same to same, 25th September 1549.
[8] Notes and Illustrations, letter I.
[9] A small fishing village on the Firth of Forth, to the north of Edinburgh.

mother embarked for France. She was accompanied by De Thermes, La Chapelle, and other French officers, and by some of the principal nobility of Scotland, amongst whom were the Earls of Huntly, Cassillis, Sutherland, and Marshal, the Lords Home, Fleming, and Maxwell, with the prelates of Caithness and Galloway.[1] Landing at Dieppe, (19th September 1550,) they immediately proceeded to Rouen, where the court was then held, and were received with much distinction.[2] Amidst the festivities which welcomed her arrival,[3] Mary of Guise explained her graver schemes against Arran to the French cabinet, and found them warmly encouraged by the Cardinal of Lorraine and the Duke of Guise. Nor did they find it difficult to bring over the French monarch to their opinion. They contended that on the success of superseding the governor depended the preservation of the French influence and of the ancient religion in Scotland. If the first failed, the other, they said, must inevitably decay; and it was to be feared, from the great progress of heresy in that country, that a reformation would be established in Scotland, similar to that which had taken place in the sister kingdom. On the contrary, if the pre-eminence of French counsels could be secured all would go well; and Ireland, which was universally ripe for insurrection, would throw off her allegiance, and needed but a token from France to be wholly at her devotion.[4] Nor was this last a vain boast. The Archbishop of Armagh, a busy envoy of the Papal government, who had been sent into that country with a commission to encourage a revolt against England, had arrived at the French court soon after the queen-dowager; and after giving an encouraging description of the universal discontent which prevailed in that unhappy country, proceeded to Rome.[5]

Convinced by such arguments, Henry declared his satisfaction with the projects of the queen-mother; and Panter, bishop of Ross, the Scottish ambassador at the court of France, with Sir Robert Carnegie and Hamilton, abbot of Kilwinning, repaired to Scotland for the purpose of breaking the affair to the regent. This they did in an artful manner: they represented to him the dilapidation of the revenue and the crown-lands which had taken place during his government, the rigid reckoning to which he must be called when the young queen came of age, and the impossibility of obtaining an honourable discharge, if he remained in his dangerous elevation. On the other hand, they held out the splendid bribe of the dukedom of Chatelherault for himself, and an establishment at the French court for his eldest son, if he agreed to resign the government; whilst they strengthened the party of the queen-mother by liberal promises to the Scottish nobles.[6] It happened that at this moment the governor was deprived of the counsels of the Archbishop of St Andrews, who then lay on what was supposed a death-bed.

[1] Lesley, p. 235. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Privy-council of England to Sir John Mason, ambassador in France, 11th August 1550. Vol. of Sir John Mason's Correspondence, State-paper Office, pp. 82, 83.

[2] Sir John Mason to the Privy-council. MS. Letter, 6th October 1550. Same vol. p. 118, State-paper Office. Lesley, p. 236.

[3] Sir John Mason, the English ambassador, describes her as almost worshipped as a goddess. Sir John Mason to Privy-council, State-paper Office. Correspondence, p. 246, 23d Feb. 1550. See Illustrations, letter K.

[4] MS. Letter, Mason to the Privy-council. Correspondence, p. 134, 19th Oct. 1550. The talk of this court amongst the baser sort is very large of our things: especially since the arriving of the Scots. . . . . Ireland, they say, is theirs when the king shall give but a token.

[5] Sir John Mason to Privy-council. MS. Letter, 8th Feb. 1550-1. Correspondence, p. 231. The archbishop's name was Wauchop. It is affirmed by Lesley, the Roman Catholic bishop of Ross, that he was blind from his infancy. But I suspect there must be here some mistake, as such blindness was a fatal objection by the laws of the Church. Sir John Mason, in speaking of him, says, "the blind Scot that *nameth himself* Archbishop of Armachan." See Lesley, p. 242.

[6] Maitland, vol. ii. p. 884. Anderson, MS. History, vol. ii. p. 153. The Earl of Huntly was promised the earldom of Moray; and the youngest son of the Earl of Rothes, whose mother was a Hamilton, was to be created an earl.

The influence of a talented opponent of the queen-mother was thus removed; and Arran, left to himself, gave a reluctant and conditional assent.[1] Having so far succeeded, Mary of Guise took leave of her daughter, the Scottish queen, and passed over from France to the court of England, where she had an amicable interview with Edward the Sixth.[2] This was politic and judicious. It evinced her resolution to preserve pacific relations with this country, and formed part of that system of universal conciliation which for the present she had determined to maintain. Some time before this the Master of Erskine, and Sinclair, the President of the Session, had proceeded on an embassy to Flanders, where they concluded a peace with the emperor;[3] and tranquillity being thus established abroad, the queen, on her return to Scotland, devoted her undivided energy to the composition of all differences amongst the nobility, and the establishment of order and good government. In justice to Arran, the regent, it ought to be stated that during her absence in France, he had exerted himself to accommodate those Border differences which had ever been so fertile a cause of exasperation; and in a convention signed by commissioners of both kingdoms at Norham, some wise regulations were introduced for the determination of the boundaries, the tranquillity of the Debateable Land, and the security of the commercial intercourse between the two countries.[4]

Nor was this all; two parliaments were held at Edinburgh in the spring and the winter of the year 1551, in which, amid much of that rude and narrow legislation which marks the age, some salutary laws were introduced. A vain attempt was made to fix the prices of wine and of provisions, and repress the inordinate luxury of the table.[5] An enactment was passed against the sins affirmed to be scandalously common: of adultery, bigamy, blasphemous swearing, and indecent behaviour during public worship; and the press, which it is declared had teemed with lewd rhymes and ballads, with scandalous songs and tragedies, was subjected to the censorship of an ordinary, and restricted by a law, which compelled every printer to obtain a licence from the queen and the governor.[6]

Subsequently to this, Arran took his progress through the northern parts of the kingdom, holding justice courts in the principal towns, and proceeded afterwards, accompanied by the queen-regent, to visit for the same purpose the western and southern districts of the realm. During the late war licentious disorders of all kinds had grown up amongst the lower classes; the restrictions of the laws were despised; the clergy, forgetful of the sanctity of their character, had quarrelled regarding the disposal of many rich vacant benefices; their friends had fiercely espoused their claims, and the country presented one wide scene of civil broil and ecclesiastical commotion. To compose this rude state of things required a union of energy and address which might have been deemed beyond the abilities of Arran, but his exertions were seconded by the queen-mother, who bent all her efforts to the task; and it says much for her talent, temper, and good sense that the measures which she adopted were successful. The clergy were satisfied, the nobles reconciled amongst themselves, the lower orders induced rather than compelled to respect the laws; and Mary of Guise, by her prudence and popular manners, so firmly attached all orders

1 Lesley, p. 238. Melvill's Memoirs, pp. 20, 21.
2 Anderson, MS. History, vol. ii. p. 155.
3 Sir John Mason, Correspondence, pp. 203, 204. State-paper Office. MS. Letter, Sir John Mason to the Privy-council, 20th Jan. 1550-1. Anderson, MS. History, vol. ii. p. 152.
4 Maitland, vol. ii. p. 885. Rymer, vol. xv. p. 265.
5 No archbishop, bishop, or earl was permitted to have more than eight dishes of meat at his table; to the abbot and prior six were allowed; barons and freeholders were restricted to four; and wealthy burgesses to three, with one kind of meat in each.
6 Maitland, vol. ii. pp. 886, 889. Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, vol. ii. pp. 483, 490, inclusive.

to her party, that the governor began to dread he would be universally deserted.[1]

This moment was artfully seized by her to remind Arran that it was now time for him to fulfil his promise, and resign the regency in her favour; but she met with an indignant refusal. He declared his resolution to retain the high office, which belonged to his rank as nearest heir to the crown; insisted that no such overtures could be entertained till the young queen had at least reached the age of twelve years; and so deeply resented the proposal, that he remained in Edinburgh with the few lords who still embraced his party, whilst the dowager held a brilliant court at Stirling.[2] He contended, and with truth, that since the peace with England he had devoted himself with unremitting assiduity to the duties of his office, to the assembling of the parliaments, the administration of justice, the improvement of the moral character of the people, the recovery of the country from the ravages committed during the war; and now, in return for all this, it was requested that he should at once descend from an almost royal rank, to the condition of a private subject, and lay down his authority at the mandate of a woman. These proud and resentful feelings, so opposite to the sentiments which he had expressed in 1551, were supposed to be instilled into the mind of Arran by his brother, the primate of St Andrews, who had now recovered his health,[3] and with it his influence over the easy temper of his relative. A determined opposition was thus reorganised against the queen-mother: the archbishop represented to his brother the madness of retiring from the supreme power, when nothing stood between him and the crown but the life of a feeble girl;[4] and nearly a year was spent in mutual crimination and intrigue.

The party of the governor, however, at length became so insignificant, that the primate was the only man of consequence left to him; and the queen, confident in her strength, threatened to call a parliament and exact an account of his administration of the royal revenue. She at the same time procured the young queen, her daughter, to select as her guardians the King of France, with her uncles, the Cardinal Lorraine and the Duke of Guise. They then devolved their authority upon the queen-dowager; and although Arran pleaded justly that the transaction was illegal, the young Mary being still in her minority, the objection was overruled, and he at last reluctantly consented to his abdication.

A parliament accordingly assembled at Edinburgh, on the 12th of April 1554, in which this solemn transaction was completed. The various instruments of agreement which had been entered into with Arran were first produced. They conferred on him the duchy of Chastelherault, and gave him an ample approval of the mode in which he had managed, and the purposes to which he had applied the revenue of the crown; he was permitted to retain the castle of Dumbarton till the Scottish queen attained majority; and he was lastly declared the second person in the realm, and, failing the queen, nearest heir to the crown. To these contracts the spiritual and temporal peers having affixed their seals, the Duke of Chastelherault, in the presence of the estates of the realm, resigned the ensigns of his authority into the hands of the queen-dowager; a commission by the Queen of Scotland was next produced and read, which appointed her mother, Mary of Lorraine, regent of her realm; and that princess, rising from her seat, accepted the office, and received the homage and congratulations of the assembled nobility. She was then conducted in a public procession with great pomp and acclamation through the city to the palace of Holyrood,

[1] Lesley, p. 245.

[2] Maitland, vol. ii. p. 891. Lesley, p. 245.

[3] By the means of the famous Cardan, "who hung him certain days by the heels, and fed him with young whelps." MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 15th Jan. 1551-2. See Illustrations, letter L.

[4] Sir James Melvill's Memoirs, pp. 21, 73. Lesley, p. 245.

and immediately entered upon the administration of the government.[1] Meantime, in the midst of these transactions, the death of Edward the Sixth (July 6, 1553,) had occasioned a great revolution in England. The accession of Mary, the restoration of the Roman Catholic faith, and the marriage between England and Spain, produced important effects upon Scotland, both in its internal state and its foreign policy, the consideration of which, however, belongs to a subsequent period of this history.

CHAPTER III.

MARY.

1554—1561.

MARY OF GUISE, who now assumed the supreme authority, was in many respects well qualified for her high station. She possessed a calm judgment; good, though not brilliant, natural parts; manners which, without losing their dignity, were feminine and engaging; and so intimate a knowledge of the character of the people over whom she ruled, that, if left to herself, there was every prospect of her managing affairs with wisdom and success. Her abilities, indeed, were sufficiently apparent in the quiet and triumphant manner in which she had brought about the revolution which placed her at the head of affairs. Although of a different religion, she had so entirely gained the affections of the Protestant party, that their support was one chief cause of her success. Nor by the prudent concessions which she made to their opponents had she alienated from herself the hearts of the adherents of the ancient faith, whose leaders she attached to her interest by gifts of the vacant benefices, and the exertion of her influence at the Papal court.[2] It was chiefly by her management that the fierce and sanguinary feuds, which for a long period had distracted the Scottish aristocracy, were composed; and her assumption of the regency was viewed with equal satisfaction by the clergy, the nobility, and the people.

But the possession of power is fraught with danger to the best. She had incurred many obligations to the court of France, which her gratitude or her promises impelled her to repay, by intruding foreigners into the offices hitherto filled by natives; and, unmindful of the extraordinary jealousy with which the Scottish people were disposed to regard all interference of this kind, she lent herself to measures dictated more by the ambition of the house of Guise, than by a desire to promote the happiness of her daughter's kingdom.

Her first act went far to disgust the nobility and the nation. Huntly, the chancellor,[3] although permitted to re-

[1] Lesley, pp. 247, 249, 250. Anderson's MS. History of Scotland, vol. ii. pp. 158, 159, 162.

[2] Lesley, pp. 241, 242. MS. Records of Privy-council, fol. 8, p. 2, in a State Paper, entitled "Answers to the most Christian King of France's Memorial," given to Thomas, master of Erskine, ambassador to the court of France.

[3] This powerful and able nobleman, who was the head of the Catholic party in Scotland, had been taken prisoner in the battle of Pinkie, by Ralph Vane, (Anderson's MS. History, vol. ii. p. 130, dorso,) but made his

tain the name, was superseded in all real power by Monsieur de Rubay, who obtained the place of vice-chancellor and possession of the great seal. Villemore was made comptroller, a place of high responsibility; and D'Osell, although placed in no office, became her confidential adviser in all matters of state.[1] These imprudent preferments excited a dissatisfaction, which was indeed smothered for the time, but afterwards broke out with fatal force against the regent.

In the meantime the kingdom became disturbed in the north, where the fierce and powerful clan Ranald, under their leader, John of Moydart, resumed their career of misrule and spoliation. The general policy hitherto pursued in these districts was that introduced by James the Fourth. It was the practice of this monarch to keep the various clans in subordination by encouraging their mutual rivalry, and employing them as checks upon each other. In the event of any sept rising into a dangerous pre-eminence, or, as was not unusual, into open rebellion, one of the most powerful northern nobles, Athole, Huntly, or Argyle, was intrusted with a commission of lieutenancy; and, on repairing to the disturbed districts with an armed force, they engaged some of the rival clans to assist in putting down the insurrection. There can be no doubt that such commissions, of which the powers were indefinite, had been often abused to the purposes of individual ambition. The great lords looked for forfeitures of the lands of the Highland chiefs to reward themselves and their followers; and, on many occasions, rather encouraged treason than promoted submission. It was a consequence of this miserable system that these chiefs continued in rebellion, not so much from any unwillingness to acknowledge the authority of the government, as from a dread of the influence and misrepresentations of their enemies.

In 1552, when the Regent Arran and the queen-dowager held their court at Inverness, John of Moydart, the leader of the clan Ranald, had treated with proud contempt their summons to appear before them; and although Argyle afterwards promised to compel his attendance, or to expose him to the extremity of fire and sword, both the promise and the penalty appear to have been forgot. In 1554, he and his adherents once more bid defiance to the government; and Huntly, armed with a commission of lieutenancy, and leading an army chiefly composed of Lowland barons, proceeded against him as far as Abertarff in Inverness-shire. His attempt, however, was singularly unsuccessful; for when it became necessary to pursue the daring outlaw into his mountain fastnesses, his Lowland leaders declined acting in a country unsuited for cavalry; whilst his Highland auxiliaries reproached him for the execution of Mackintosh, captain of the clan Chattan,[2] and shewed such marked symptoms of disaffection, that Huntly deemed it prudent to conclude his inglorious expedition, and return to court.

His enemies eagerly seized this opportunity to conspire his ruin. His conduct, they contended, amounted to treason; and they insisted that nothing but Huntly's confidence in his exorbitant power could have induced him to have acted with such flagrant contempt of the orders which he had received from his sovereign. To such accusations the queen lent a willing ear. The earl was cast into prison, stripped of his high offices, and sentenced to be banished for five years to France.[3] When we consider the services so lately performed by Huntly in the revolution which gave Mary of Guise the regency, it is difficult to understand the causes of that sudden

escape in 1548, and on his return to Scotland was restored to his office of chancellor. An interesting account of his escape will be found in Anderson's MS. History, vol. ii. pp. 130, 131.

[1] Keith's Eccl. History, pp. 69, 70. Lesley, pp. 250, 251. Anderson's MS. History, vol. ii. p. 174, dorso.

[2] Lesley, pp. 251, 252. Maitland, vol. ii. p. 893.

[3] Gregory's History of the Western Highlands and Isles, pp. 183, 184.

resentment to which he fell a victim. That he had abused the high powers intrusted to him, in the administration of the northern counties, is not improbable; and his imperious demeanour had perhaps provoked the resentment of the queen's foreign advisers. One of these, Monsieur de Bontot, superseded him in his government of Orkney. De Rubay, we have already seen, in his character of vice-chancellor, had monopolised all the powers of the great seal, which properly belonged to Huntly as chancellor; and although he still kept the name of this office, and, by the payment of a heavy fine, procured the remission of his sentence of banishment, he remained stripped of his strength, and confined to the solitude of his estates.[1]

Notwithstanding these occasional demonstrations of severity against her Scottish nobles, the exertions of the queen-regent were for some years successfully devoted to the maintenance of peace, and the promotion of the real welfare of the kingdom. Commissioners from England and Scotland met and established tranquillity upon the Borders. She received assurances from Mary of England of her anxious desire for the preservation of friendly feelings between the two countries, and in return expressed a hope that this princess would not only be a "peace-keeper, but a peace-maker," in promoting a reconciliation between the French monarch and the emperor.[2]

At home a parliament assembled at Edinburgh,[3] in which many wise and judicious laws were introduced for the abbreviation of legal processes, and the administration of equal justice throughout the country. Upon this subject, the regent was principally guided by the sage counsels of Henry Sinclair, dean of Glasgow, a man of profound legal knowledge, and almost equal eminence as a scholar and a statesman.[4] It appears by one of these statutes that the maintenance of French soldiers within the realm, a subject which proved subsequently a fertile source of revolt, had even then occasioned discontent. Another evinces the growth of that spirit of reform which too austerely proscribed such unruly personages as Robin Hood, Little John, the Queen of May, and the Abbot of Unreason; and prohibited those ancient games and festivals in which women, "singing about summer trees," (to adopt the poetic phraseology of the statute,) disturbed the queen and her lieges in their progress through the country.[5] From this statute we may infer that Mary of Guise was still disposed to favour the Protestant party, to whose support she owed much of her success; and had she been permitted to follow the dictates of her own good sense, her administration would have continued popular. But, unfortunately, the war between France and England, and the influence which her brothers, the princes of the house of Guise, had acquired over her mind, compelled her about this time to the adoption of a measure which occasioned amongst the minor barons and the great body of the people extreme jealousy and disgust. She proposed to take an inventory of every man's estate and substance, and to impose a tax for the support of a large body of troops, which should serve instead of the usual national force, composed of the barons and their feudal retainers. The idea, which was none other than a scheme for a standing army, originated with the French and some of the highest Scottish nobility; but it met with a stern and prompt opposition. Three hundred barons and gentlemen assembled in the abbey church of Holyrood, and despatched the Lairds of Wemyss and Calder with their remonstrances to the regent. Their fathers, they said, had for many

[1] He was compelled to resign some lucrative gifts of lands, particularly the earldoms of Mar and Moray. Gregory's History, p. 184.

[2] State-paper Office, Mary to the Queen-regent, January 12, 1553. MS. Letter, Original Draft. Also, State-paper Office, MS. Letter, Lord Conyers to the Council. B. C., March 12, 1554-5, Berwick.

[3] June 10, 1555.

[4] Life of Sir Thomas Craig, pp. 79-81.

[5] Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, vol. ii. p. 500.

centuries defended their native country against every attack, with their faithful vassals and their good swords. It was the ancient custom of the realm—they held their lands by that tenure; and as they trusted they had not degenerated from their ancestry, they besought the queen to use them as heretofore in that honourable service. Their monarch, they contended, was called King of Scots, with a special reference to his authority over the men, rather than over the substance of the country; and loath should they be, they declared, to intrust to any waged and mercenary soldiers the protection of their wives, their children, and their hearths, when they were ready and able with their own hands to defend them at the peril of their lives. It evinced the good sense of the queen-regent that she instantly desisted from the project, and acknowledged her error in having ever proposed it.[1]

This wise conduct was for some time followed by the triumph of pacific counsels in Scotland. The ablest amongst the clergy and the most influential of the nobility, both Catholic and Protestant, strongly advocated their adoption; and commissioners having met, a treaty for the continuance of peace was concluded between the two nations;[2] but war having broken out between France and Spain, a sudden revolution appears to have taken place in the mind of the queen-dowager. On the one part, she beheld the Spanish or imperial party in Italy, headed by Philip, and now, since his marriage with Mary, strengthened by the accession of England; on the other, the Pope supported by the French king.[3] To the latter side the daughter of the house of Guise naturally leant; and Henry the Second, aware of the importance of procuring such a diversion, omitted no effort to induce the regent to invade England. Encouraged by these symptoms of approaching hostilities, the Scottish Borderers, who seldom waited for a declaration of war, broke violently across the marches, cruelly ravaged the country in successive inroads,[4] and were only checked by a severe defeat, which Lord Hume received at Blackbrey.[5] D'Osell in the meantime, one of the dowager's foreign advisers, and lately ambassador from the French court, raised a fort at Eyemouth, near Berwick, anticipating a speedy visit from the English, who instantly attacked him. This was all that was required; war was denounced, and the queen-dowager having assembled an army at Kelso, proposed an immediate invasion. She was met by a positive and mortifying refusal: Chastelherault, Huntly, Cassillis, and Argyle declared that the national honour had been amply asserted by the Border successes during the preceding months; they were ready, they said, to act on the defensive, but to plunge into war during the minority of their sovereign, with the single object of assisting France, would be as injurious as it was uncalled for. All parties, except the queen-regent and the French auxiliaries, agreed in the wisdom of this conduct; but the queen-regent was deeply incensed: she attempted to precipitate hostilities by commanding the foreigners to attack Wark, and having failed in this last resource, dismissed the army with expressions of anger and disgust.[6]

It is from this moment that we may date that unhappy division between the queen-regent and the Scottish nobles, which formed afterwards one of the principal causes of the war of the Reformation. At present, how-

[1] Lesley, p. 255. Keith, p. 71. Herries' Memoirs, pp. 29, 30. Anderson's MS. Hist., vol. ii. pp. 181, 182.

[2] Lesley, pp. 258, 259. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 10th July 1557, Earl of Westmoreland and the Bishop of Durham to Queen Mary.

[3] Lesley, pp. 258, 259.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B. C., Council to Lord Wharton, 29th July 1557.

[5] MS. 10th Nov. 1557, State-paper Office, B. C. Orig. Minute, Names of the Gentlemen taken at the battle of Blackbrey; since printed by Mr Stevenson in his Illustrations of the Reign of Queen Mary, p. 70.

[6] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B. C., Lord Wharton to the Council, 14th Nov. 1557, Berwick, Maitland, vol. ii. p. 900. Lesley, Hist., pp. 260, 261. Anderson's MS. Hist., pp. 184, 185.

ever, religious differences did not enter into the dispute. The great object of Mary of Guise was to bridle the power of Chastelherault, Argyle, and Huntly, who had opposed the councils of France; and it is remarkable that, at this moment, James, prior of St Andrews, styled by Lord Wharton, "one of the wisest of the late king's base sons," and afterwards the Regent Moray, made his appearance in public life as an adherent of the dowager. Sir William Kirkaldy, with young Maitland of Lethington, the secretary, a man of great talents and ambition, espoused the same faction; and it was proposed to recall secretly into Scotland the Earl of Lennox and the Lady Margaret Douglas, whose restoration to their former rank and power might prove, it was hoped, an effectual counterpoise to the influence of their opponents.[1]

Some unforeseen impediments, however, interrupted the execution of this scheme, and the regent had recourse to a more effectual mode of strengthening her influence. A parliament assembled at Edinburgh,[2] in which a letter was presented from the King of France, earnestly recommending that the intended marriage between the dauphin and the young Queen of Scots should be carried into effect. He requested that commissioners should be sent over to give the sanction of their presence to this solemnity; and, in compliance with his wishes, Beaton, the archbishop of Glasgow; Reid, president of the Session; Cassillis, lord high treasurer; the Lords Fleming and Seton, with the Prior of St Andrews, and Erskine of Dun, the leaders of the Protestant party, were chosen to execute this important mission. They were instructed not to consent to the marriage until they had obtained from the queen and the dauphin a promise, in the most ample form, for the preservation of the integrity of the kingdom, and the observation of its ancient laws and liberties. The young queen and her husband were to be required at the same time to grant a commission for a regent, to whom the supreme power was to be delegated.

The commissioners, after a perilous passage, in which two of their convoy were wrecked, disembarked at Boulogne, and proceeding to the French court, received an honourable reception, and found a ready compliance with all their demands. Having secured, as they imagined, the rights of the kingdom, they proceeded to arrange the conditions of the marriage.[3] It was provided that the eldest son of the marriage should be King of France and Scotland; the dauphin, by consent of the French king, his father, and the queen, his consort, was to bear the name and title of King of Scotland; to be allowed to quarter the arms of that crown with his own; and, on his accession to the throne of France, to assume the title and arms of both kingdoms united under one crown. In the event of there being only daughters of the marriage, the eldest was to be Queen of Scotland; to have, as a daughter of France, a portion of four hundred thousand crowns; and to be disposed of in marriage with the united consent of the estates of Scotland and the King of France. The jointure of the young queen was fixed at six hundred thousand livres if her husband died after his accession to the throne; but if she became a widow when he was dauphin, it was to be reduced to half that sum. Lastly, the commissioners agreed, immediately after the marriage, to swear fealty to the dauphin, in the name of the estates of Scotland, and on the ground that their sovereign the dauphiness was his consort.[4] These preliminaries having been arranged, the marriage was solemnised at Paris by the Cardinal Bourbon, in the cathe-

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B. C., Lord Wharton to the Council, 14th Nov. 1557.

[2] Dec. 14, 1557.

[3] This was on 19th April 1558. Keith, Hist., pp. 72, 73. Ibid., Appendix, p. 13.

[4] Keith, Appendix, p. 21. "A cause de la dite Dame Reyne Dauphine nostre Souveraine, son Espouse et Compaigne." The meaning is, that they swear fealty to the dauphin as the husband of their queen.

dral church of Notre Dame. It completed the almost despotic power of the house of Guise; and the proud princes of this family, who saw their niece already a queen, now promoted to the rank of dauphiness, were solicitous to impart to the ceremony all imaginable splendour. The King and Queen of France, four cardinals, the princes of the blood, and the flower of the French nobility, surrounded the altar; and the classic genius of Buchanan hailed the event in an Epithalamium, which is one of the sweetest effusions of his muse.

Such were the outward forms which preceded and accompanied this important union; and in appearance the conduct of the French court was fair and honourable; but another, and a far different scene of Guisian treachery and ambition had been acting within the recesses of the cabinet. Ten days previous to her marriage, three papers were presented to the young queen. By the first, she made over her kingdom of Scotland, in free gift, to the King of France, if she died childless; by the second, drawn up to meet the very probable case of a resistance by the Scots to so extraordinary a transfer, she assigned to the same monarch the possession of her kingdom, till he should be reimbursed in the sum of a million pieces of eight, or any such greater sum as he should have expended upon her education in France; and by the last she was made to declare that these two deeds contained the genuine sense of her mind, whatever might appear to the contrary in any declarations which she should publish, in compliance with the desire of her parliament.[1] These secret deeds the Guises induced their niece to sign; she was only fifteen, completely under their influence, and probably dreamt not of resistance; but when they brought the Scottish commissioners before the French council, and required them not only to swear fealty to the king-dauphin, but to agree that he should receive the ensigns of royalty, they were met in this step of their ambition by a peremptory refusal: "Our instructions," said the ambassadors, "are distinct, and embrace no such matter, and even if free, it is little the part of faithful friends to name to us a proposal which, if agreed to, would cover us with infamy."[2]

Disguising their resentment, the princes of the house of Guise requested that the commissioners would at least support their interests in the parliament; and the Scottish prelates and nobles set out on their return. On reaching Dieppe, Reid, the bishop of Orkney, one of the wisest and most upright men in Scotland, died suddenly on the 6th of September; after two days, he was followed to the grave by the Earl of Rothes; Cassillis, within a very brief interval, was seized with a similar illness, which carried him off; Fleming did not long survive him; and although no infectious disease was then prevalent in the country, several of their retinue sickened and expired. It was not surprising that men should connect these circumstances with the scenes lately acted at Paris; and there arose a suspicion that the commissioners were poisoned by the Duke of Guise and his brothers, who had thus determined to get rid of an influence which they knew would be exerted against them.[3] The Archbishop of Glasgow, the Prior of St Andrews, Lord Seton, and the Laird of Dun, continuing their voyage, arrived in Scotland in October, and the queen-regent immediately summoned a parliament, which assembled at Edinburgh in the beginning of December.

Its proceedings were brief, but important. On receiving from the surviving ambassadors an account of their mission, the three estates approved and ratified their transactions. It was agreed at the same time that the crown matrimonial should be given to the dauphin; that he should have the name of King of Scotland during the continuance of the marriage; that all

[1] Keith, p. 74.

[2] Maitland, p. 903.

[3] Keith, p. 75. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 10th August 1560. Ibid., Ledington to Cecil, 15th August 1560.

letters in Scotland should henceforth run in the style of "Francis and Mary, King and Queen of Scotland, Dauphin and Dauphiness of Vienne;" and that the great seal of the kingdom and the current money of the realm should be changed.[1] During the progress of these negotiations, hostilities with England had continued, and the war between that country and France was carried on with signal success upon the side of the Duke of Guise, whose arms were crowned with the long-coveted conquest of Calais. But this triumph was soon after followed by the death of Mary of England, and the accession of Elizabeth to the throne; an event which occasioned an immediate change in the councils of that kingdom, and produced consequences especially worthy of attention.

It is well known that this great princess commenced her reign by the complete establishment of the Reformation in her own dominions, and by placing herself at the head of the Protestant party in Europe. Indifferent herself to religion, as far as it influences the individual character, she hated the Puritans, and was attached to the pomp and show of prelacy. But her masculine understanding had early detected the errors of the Roman Catholic faith; her mind, naturally imperious, refused equally to acknowledge in man a spiritual or a temporal superior; and her discernment, aided by the councils of the far-reaching Cecil, taught her, that to continue faithful to the principles of the Reformation offered the best hopes for the preservation of peace, the restoration of her exhausted finances, and the security of her kingdom. At home, two great principles regulated her government,—a determination to avoid war, even at considerable sacrifices, and to enforce in every department of the state a rigid economy. To the great majority of her subjects, her accession to the throne was a joyful event; yet Elizabeth was aware that a large proportion of the people, far larger indeed than is commonly imagined, were still attached to the ancient faith, and she was naturally jealous of everything that tended to increase the political power of Rome. Whilst she thus carefully watched the state of the two parties within her own dominions, she saw on the continent the same struggle of opinion dividing the leading states into two great factions; and by skilfully balancing them against each other, she contrived to keep them too much occupied at home to be able to give her any serious annoyance. The loss of Calais, which for two centuries had been in the possession of England, and still more, the resolution on the part of the Guises to assert the title of their niece, the Queen of Scotland, to the English throne, in exclusion of Elizabeth, whom they pronounced illegitimate, were circumstances calculated to rouse the indignation of this princess. At a future period she clearly shewed that Mary's assumption of the arms of England, whilst still Queen of France, had not been forgotten by her; but for the present, policy got the better of resentment, and after having declined a proposal upon the part of the French monarch to enter into a private and separate peace, she became a party to the public treaty concluded between France and Spain, at Chateau Cambresis, (25th May 1559.)[2]

Her chief difficulties lay on the side of Scotland. In her instructions to the Bishop of Ely, Lord William Howard, and Dr Nicholas Wotton, whom she sent soon after her accession to negotiate the treaty with France, we find her laying down the principle, that peace with Scotland is of greater consequence than peace with France, and that unless the Scots should be included, it were needless to continue the negotiations.[3]

[1] Lesley, p. 268. Keith, p. 77.

[2] MS. State-paper Office, Original oath signed by Elizabeth to observe the treaty of Chateau Cambresis. French Correspondence, May 1559, and attestation of the taking the oath, by Sir W. Cecil, Ibid.

[3] MS. State-paper Office. Instructions to Lord Wm. Howard, Thomas Thirlby, bishop of Ely, and Dr Wotton, 28th Feb. 1558-9. Sir J. Williamson's Collection, first series, vol. xix. p. 433, in Cecil's handwriting, cor-

Nor did the queen-regent appear unwilling to meet these advances: she despatched her able secretary, Maitland of Lethington, to assist at the conferences in France;[1] and at the same time that a pacification was concluded between England, France, and Spain,[2] a separate treaty for the cessation of hostilities was entered into between England and Scotland.[3] It was declared, that from this time a firm and lasting peace should be concluded between the two countries; that, to remove all ground of controversy, Eyemouth, and the new fortifications raised by the king-dauphin and the Queen of Scots, should be destroyed, and that all castles or strengths lately built by the English on the Borders should be cast down. Some minor points were reserved for the determination of commissioners, sent mutually by both kingdoms; and these envoys having met at Norham, (31st May 1559,) the negotiations were brought to a successful termination.[4]

Elizabeth had thus apparently accomplished the object which she so much desired; yet she knew too well the internal state of France, and the seeds of division which had been planted in Scotland, to rely on the continuance of amicable relations: the strong footing which the French had already gained in that kingdom, the late marriage of the young queen with the dauphin, and the vast ambition of the house of Guise, rendered her anxious to adopt every method for the strengthening of the Protestant cause, and the dismissal of the French auxiliaries from the service of the queen-dowager. But before we attempt to fathom her deep and somewhat unscrupulous policy for the attainment of these objects, it becomes necessary to look back for a moment that we may trace the progress of the Reformation in Scotland.

The history of this great revolution in the history of the human mind is in Scotland connected almost exclusively with one extraordinary man—the intrepid and unbending Knox. When we last parted with him, it was after the surrender of the castle of St Andrews, (1547,) when he and other fellow-sufferers were carried prisoners aboard the galleys, into France. After a long and tedious captivity, he regained his liberty, (1550,) in consequence of the intercession of Edward the Sixth with the French monarch;[5] and having repaired to England, he found himself cordially welcomed and supported by the ministers of the young sovereign. Here he willingly gave his powerful aid to Cranmer, in the establishment of that Reformation which had been left imperfect by Henry the Eighth; but the sudden death of the king, and the accession of Mary, compelled him to fly to the Continent. During his exile, he was called to be minister of the English refugees at Frankfort; but his attachment to the doctrines of Calvin, with whom he had formed an intimate friendship, made it impossible for him to adopt the principles of those who preferred the service book of Edward the Sixth to the more simple and, as it appeared to Knox, the more scriptural form of Presbyterian worship, which at first, in compliance with their wishes, he had introduced amongst them. Religious dissensions arose. Dr Cox, who had been tutor to Edward, vehemently contended for the service book. His party became all-powerful; and the Scottish reformer, driven from his pulpit and accused by his opponents of treason against the emperor,

rected by the queen. See also Forbes' State Papers, vol. i. p. 59.

[1] MS. State-paper Office, Queen Dowager to Elizabeth, March 4, 1558-9.

[2] 2d April 1559.

[3] Rymer, Fœdera, vol. xv. p. 513. Ibid., p. 527. Also MS. Instructions of Elizabeth to Lord William Howard; Lord Howard of Effingham, Dr Wotton, and Sir N. Throgmorton, 6th May 1559, State-paper Office; Sir J. Williamson's Collection, vol. xix. p. 419; also Letter of Elizabeth to Mary of Guise, 30th May 1559, State-paper Office.

[4] MSS. Treasurer's accounts in Register Office, Edinburgh, under March 3, 1558-9; To William Maitland of Lethington, passing to London and France in the Queen's Grace's affairs, £750.

[5] The proofs of this fact will be found in a work which the author published in 1839, "England under the Reigns of Edward VI. and Mary," vol. i. p. 295.

once more retreated into his native country, and took up his residence in the capital. Before leaving the Continent, he had again visited Calvin, at Geneva. The conversation of this celebrated man, then in the height of his reputation, confirmed Knox in his affection to that form of worship which had been established at Geneva. His solitary reflections in exile, and under persecution, had, as we learn from his eloquent and pathetic letters, assumed an extraordinary bitterness of self-reproach: they seemed to upbraid him as one who had fled from the fold, and deserted his flock when the spiritual conflict most required his presence; and he returned to Scotland in 1555 with the stern resolution to "spare no arrows," to abide at his post, and to sacrifice everything for the complete establishment of the Reformation, according to those principles which he believed to be founded on the Word of God.

During his absence from his native country, the persecutions of Mary had driven some of the reformers to take refuge in Scotland. Harlow, originally a tradesman in the lower ranks of life, but afterwards a zealous preacher under Edward the Sixth, took up his abode in Ayrshire, and assembled around him a little congregation; John Willock, a Scottish Franciscan Friar, who had been converted to Protestantism, and afterwards admitted a chaplain to the Duke of Suffolk, was another of these labourers. He had been sent twice, in 1555 and 1558, on missions from the Duchess of Friesland, in whose dominions he had sought refuge, to the queen-regent; and as his affability, moderation, and address were equal to his learning and piety, he was received with distinction, and privately permitted to address his exhortations to all who were anxious for instruction.

The second arrival of Willock gave a great impulse to the cause of the Reformation. "The images," says Knox, "were stolen away, in all parts of the country; and in Edinburgh, that great idol called St Giles was first drowned in the North Loch, and afterwards burnt, which raised no small trouble in the town." Notwithstanding this marked demonstration, it was resolved by the queen-regent and the bishops that the usual procession appointed for the saint's day should not be omitted; and having procured another image from the Grey Friars, and fixed it to a wooden barrow, which was borne on men's shoulders, the cavalcade, headed by the regent herself, surrounded by priests and canons, and attended by tabors and trumpets, proceeded down the High Street towards the cross. The sight inflamed the passions of the Protestants; and various bands of the citizens, abhorring what they esteemed an abomination, resolved upon revenge. Nor was it long before this was accomplished: for scarce had the queen-dowager retired, when some of these, under pretence of assisting the bearers, caught hold of the barrow, cast down the image, and dashed it to pieces on the pavement; and then (I use Knox's words) "the priests and friars fled faster than they did at Pinkie-cleuch: down go the crosses, off go the surplices, round caps, coronets, with the crowns. The Grey Friars gaped, the Black Friars blew, the priests panted and fled, and happy was he that first gat the house, for such a sudden fray came never among the generation of Antichrist within this realm before."[1]

Yet although some progress had been made, and Knox hailed with gratitude the co-operation of Willock, it was with feelings of astonishment, bordering upon horror, that he found the friends of the Protestant opinions unresolved upon the great question whether it was their duty openly to separate from the Roman Catholic Church. Many of them continued still to sanction by their presence the celebration of the mass; and as the queen-dowager had found it necessary, in the prosecution of her political objects, to extend her favour to the Protestants, they were anxious to stretch their conformity to the national Church, as far, perhaps even farther than their consciences permitted. The discourses of the reformer, who at first preached privately to a few friends in

[1] Knox, p. 104.

the house of James Syme, a burgess of Edinburgh, soon threw a new light upon the danger of such concessions.[1] Men's consciences became alarmed. A solemn disputation was held upon the point between Maitland of Lethington and Knox. The secretary, a man of remarkable learning and ingenuity, exerted his powers to defend the practice which he and his brethren had adopted. But Knox, deeply read in the Scriptures, undaunted in his adherence to what he esteemed the truth, and master of a familiar and fervid eloquence, which was adapted to the age and the audience, triumphed over his more elegant and subtle disputant. Maitland acknowledged his error; the practice was renounced, and it was agreed by the congregation which now surrounded the reformer that a public and formal separation must henceforth be made from the Catholic Church in Scotland.[2]

Amongst his hearers and followers at this time (1555) we find some men who became afterwards noted in the history of their country: Erskine of Dun, a baron of ancient family, whose learning was superior to the times; Sir James Sandilands, commonly called Lord St John, a veteran in his adherence to the Reformation; Archibald, Lord Lorn, afterwards Earl of Argyle; the Master of Mar; the Lord James, afterwards regent; the Earl of Glencairn, and the Earl Marshal, were usually present at his sermons, and ardent admirers of his doctrine. At length the Catholic clergy, hitherto unaccountably indifferent, roused themselves from their lethargy, and Knox was summoned to appear before an ecclesiastical convention in the capital.[3] He repaired to Edinburgh prepared to defend his principles, and to his astonishment found the diet deserted, and his pulpit surrounded, not by his accusers, but by crowds of affectionate and zealous disciples, to whom for a short season he was permitted to preach without interruption or disturbance. This liberty he probably owed to the toleration of the queen-regent; but when, at the request of the Earl Marshal, he carried his boldness so far as to address to this daughter of the house of Guise a letter, in which he exhorted her not only to protect the reformed preachers, but to lend a favourable ear to their doctrine, he found his propositions received with derision and contempt. Receiving his letter from Glencairn, and glancing carelessly over it, the dowager handed it to the Archbishop of Glasgow, asking him if his lordship was solicitous to read a pasquil—a mode of proceeding which the reformer treated afterwards with uncommon severity.[4]

At this critical period, when rejoicing in the success of his preaching, and congratulating himself that the time of the Church's deliverance was drawing nigh, Knox received an invitation to become pastor of the reformed congregation at Geneva; and the readiness with which he obeyed the summons is an inexplicable circumstance in his life.[5] Although his labours had been singularly rewarded, the infant congregation which he had gathered round him still required his nurture and protection. During his last journey into Angus, the threatenings of the friars and bishops had increased, and the clouds of persecution were seen gathering around him. The state of the Reformation at Geneva, on the contrary, was prosperous. He had before bitterly upbraided himself for deserting his appointed charge in the hour of peril; yet he now repeated the same conduct, left his native country, and settled with his family on the Continent. It was in vain to tell his followers, as he did, that if they continued in godliness, whenever they pleased they might command his return. They were continuing in the truth, as he has himself informed us, and they earnestly but unsuccessfully endeavoured to detain him. The rage,

[1] Knox, pp. 98, 99. Keith, p. 64. M'Crie, vol. i. p. 176.

[2] M'Crie's Life of Knox, vol. i. p. 177. Anderson's MS. Hist., vol. ii. pp. 173, 174. The disputation was held at a supper given by the Laird of Dun.

[3] Anderson's MS. Hist., p. 175.

[4] M'Crie's Life, vol. i. p. 188.

[5] Keith, p. 65.

indeed, of his opponents was about to assume at this time a deadly aspect. They had delated him to the queen as an enemy to magistrates, as well as a seducer of the people, and possibly by retiring he saved his life;[1] but judging with all charity, it must be admitted that, whilst his writings at this season had all the impassioned zeal, his conduct betrayed some want of the ardent courage of the martyr.

His retreat had an immediate and unfavourable effect on the progress of the new opinions. The bishops and the friars increased in boldness and violence. Knox, whose personal encounter they dreaded, now that his appearance was impossible, received a summons to stand his trial; condemnation followed, and he was burnt in effigy at the high cross of the capital.[2] Previous to his departure, the reformer exhorted his followers to continue their private meetings, which he said they ought to open and conclude with prayer, to read the Scriptures, and to listen to the word of exhortation from any experienced brother, provided his instructions were given with modesty and a desire to edify. Such directions they willingly obeyed; and secure in the countenance and protection of the queen-mother, who at this time courted their assistance, they became less the objects of jealousy and persecution to their adversaries of the Catholic faith. Nor were they long left without preachers. In the year succeeding the retirement of Knox, John Douglas, a converted Carmelite friar, who was chaplain to the Earl of Argyle, not only addressed a private congregation, but spoke openly at the court against some superstitions of the times. Paul Methven, originally a tradesman, began to teach in Dundee; others exhorted the people in Angus and Mearns, and the Roman clergy taking alarm, so far succeeded in working upon the fears of the regent that she issued a proclamation summoning the preachers to answer for their conduct. This they prepared instantly to obey, but the gentlemen of the west of Scotland, who formed the chief part of their congregations, resolved to accompany them to their trial, and many already had arrived in the capital, when the queen, dreading a tumult, commanded all who had no express exemption to repair for fifteen days to the Borders. Far from submitting to an order of which they easily detected the object, the barons surrounded the palace, obtained an audience, and in reply to the remonstrances of the regent thus addressed her—"We know, madam, that this is the device of the bishops who now stand beside you. We avow to God we shall make a day of it. They oppress us and our poor tenants to feed themselves; they trouble our ministers, and seek to undo them and us all. We will not suffer it any longer." This bold address was delivered by Chalmers of Gathgirth, one of the barons of the west; and it is said, as he concluded it, his companions, who had hitherto been uncovered, with an air of defiance put on their steel caps. The regent was intimidated, declared that she meant no violence against their teachers, revoked the proclamation, and promised to be herself the judge of the controversy.[3]

This success, and a period of tranquillity which succeeded to it, emboldened the leaders of the reform party, the Earl of Glencairn, Lord Lorn, son of the Earl of Argyle, Erskine of Dun, and the Prior of St Andrews, afterwards the celebrated Regent Moray, to request the return of Knox to his native country. In a letter addressed to the reformer they informed him that the "faithful of his acquaintance were steadfast to the belief in which he had left them, that

[1] Such is the opinion of his late able biographer, Dr M'Crie. Anderson's MS. Hist., vol. ii. p. 175, dorso. In a collection of manuscript letters relative to Scottish History, in the possession of Mr Dawson Turner, and which the kindness of that gentleman permitted me to look over, there is an anonymous Paper, entitled "The Apology of our Departure," which appears to me to be the composition of the reformer at this interesting crisis. It proves that Knox fled for fear of his life.

[2] In 1556.

[3] Knox's Hist., p. 103. Spottiswood, B. ii. p. 94. Keith, p. 65.

they thirsted for his presence, and were ready to jeopard their lives for the glory of God. "Little cruelty," they observed, "had been used against them; the influence of the friars was decreasing, and they had good hopes that God would augment his flock."

Obeying this invitation, Knox resigned his charge at Geneva, and arriving at Dieppe on his way to Scotland, was met there, to his grief and mortification, by letters which arrested his journey. They stated that the zeal of the reformers had suddenly cooled; that many, contented with the toleration they enjoyed, preferred the security of worshipping God in private according to their conscience, to the peril attending a public reformation; and that the scheme which had given rise to their letter had been precipitately abandoned. It did not belong to the disposition or principles of the reformer to bear this vacillating conduct in silence. He addressed to them an immediate and indignant remonstrance, urged upon them the sacred duty of accomplishing the great work which they had begun; assured them that although dangers and trials must be met with in its prosecution, their relinquishing it would not save them from the most tyrannical proscription; and concluded by reminding them that so vitally important a matter as the reformation of religion belonged to them, the nobility, even more than to the clergy or chief rulers called kings.[1]

This epistle, which was accompanied by a detailed address to the nobles, and by private letters to Erskine of Dun and Wishart of Pitarrow, two leading men amongst the reformers, produced an astonishing effect. The lords deplored their weakness; a new impulse was given to the cause; zeal and resolution animated their repentant followers; and on the 3d of December 1557 that memorable bond or covenant was drawn up which henceforth united the Protestants under one great association, which was subscribed immediately by their principal supporters, and could not be deserted without something like apostasy. It described, in no mild or measured terms, the bishops and ministers of the Roman Catholic Church, as members of Sathan, who sought to destroy the gospel of Christ and his followers; and declared that they felt it to be their duty to strive in their Master's cause even unto death—certain as they were of victory in Him. For this purpose it declared that they had entered into a solemn promise in the presence of "the Majesty of God and his congregation," to set forward and establish with their whole power and substance His blessed Word—to labour to have faithful ministers—to defend them at the peril of their lives and goods against all tyranny; and it concluded by anathematising their adversaries, and denouncing vengeance against all the superstition, idolatry, and abominations of the Roman Church.[2]

This bond, which was drawn up at Edinburgh, received the signatures of the Earls of Glencairn, Argyle, Morton, Lord Lorn, Erskine of Dun, and many others. It was evidently an open declaration of war against the established religion—toleration and compromise were at an end; and their next step shewed that the Congregation, for so the reformers now named themselves, were determined to commence their proceedings in earnest. They passed a resolution, declaring "that in all parishes of the realm the common prayers," (by which was meant the service book of Edward the Sixth,[3]) "should be read weekly, on Sunday and other festival days, in the parish churches, with the lessons of the Old and New Testament conform to the order of the Book of Common Prayer; and that, if the curates of parishes be qualified, they shall be caused to read the same;" but if they refuse, then the most qualified in the parish were directed to supply their place. It was resolved at the same time, that "doctrine, preaching, and interpretation of Scripture be used privately in quiet houses, avoiding

[1] Keith, pp. 65, 66.

[2] Keith, p. 66. Knox's Hist. p. 110.

[3] This will be afterwards proved.

great conventions of the people thereto, until such time as God should move the prince to grant public preaching by true and faithful ministers."[1]

These resolutions the Lords of the Congregation proceeded to put in execution in such places as were under their power. The Earl of Argyle encouraged Douglas, his chaplain, to preach openly in his house; other barons imitated his example; a second invitation was addressed to Knox,[2] requesting his immediate presence amongst them, and a deep alarm seized the whole body of the Roman clergy. They represented, not unreasonably, the declarations of the Congregation, and their subsequent conduct, as acts bordering upon treason; the Catholic faith, they said, was still the established religion of the state; it enjoyed the sanction of the laws, and the protection of the sovereign; and it was now openly attacked, and attempted to be subverted by a private association of men, who, although no ways recognised by the constitution, had assumed the power of legislation. To what this might grow it was difficult to say; but it was impossible to view so bold a denunciation of the national religion without apprehension and dismay.[3]

These remonstrances were addressed to the queen-regent at that critical season, when the marriage between her daughter and the dauphin, although proposed in the Scottish parliament, had not been fully agreed to. It was necessary for her to manage matters warily with the principal nobles, and she expressed a steadfast disinclination to all extreme measures against the Congregation. The Archbishop of St Andrews also, a prelate whose character partook nothing of cruelty, though his morals were loose, addressed an admonitory letter to Argyle, persuading him to dismiss his heretical chaplain, promising to supply his place with a learned and Catholic instructor, complaining of the reproaches to which his ecclesiastical lenity had exposed him, and insinuating that repeated provocations might compel him, as the spiritual guardian of the Church, to adopt a severer course.[4] Nor was it long before this severity was experienced, although there seems good ground for believing that the prelate was innocent of having instigated it. Walter Miln, a parish priest of Lunan, in Angus, had early embraced the doctrines of the Reformation; and having been seized and condemned as a heretic in the time of Beaton, was so fortunate as to escape from prison and remain in concealment in his native country. Encouraged by the subsequent leniency of the queen-dowager, this venerable minister, who was past eighty, had openly preached to the people; but the severity of the clergy again compelled him to seek his lurking places, and being discovered at this time, he was tried for heresy at St Andrews, and condemned to be burnt. From his feeble frame and great age it was expected that he would say little in his defence, but the old man exhibited uncommon spirit, and so deeply moved were all who heard his pathetic and ardent appeal, that after the clergy had pronounced him guilty no secular judge could be found to pass sentence. The odious office, however, was at last performed by a dissolute retainer of the Archbishop's, and he was led to the stake amid the tears and sympathy of an immense multitude, who execrated the cruelty of which he was the victim. Even when surrounded by the flames he yet asserted that the cause for which he sacrificed his life was the defence of the truth of Jesus Christ. "As for myself," said he, "I am fourscore and two years old, and cannot live long by the course of nature; but a hundred better shall rise out of the ashes of my bones: and I trust in God I am the last that shall suffer death in Scotland for this cause."[5] And his wishes were happily fulfilled: he *was* the last victim in that country of a

[1] Keith, p. 66. Knox, p. 111.
[2] November 1558.
[3] Cook, vol. ii. p. 35. Spottiswood, p. 117.
[4] March 1558.
[5] M'Crie's Life of Knox, vol. i. p. 234. Knox, p. 30. Spottiswood, p. 95.

cruel and short-sighted persecution. (April 1558.)

This execution was viewed by the people with horror, and excited the utmost indignation in the leaders of the Congregation. They remonstrated in firm terms with the queen-regent, and when this princess assured them that she was no party to such sanguinary proceedings, their whole animosity was directed against the clergy. Emissaries, commissioned by the reformers, travelled through the country, exposing the superstition, wickedness, and injustice of such conduct; many of the lesser barons, and the greater part of the towns, joined the party; a majority of the people declared themselves ready to support the cause, and the Protestant lords presented an address to the dowager, in which they claimed redress at her hands "of the unjust tyranny used against them by those called the estate ecclesiastical."[1] "Your Grace," said they, "cannot be ignorant what controversy hath been, and yet is, concerning the true religion and right worshipping of God, and how the clergy (as they will be termed) usurp to themselves such empire over the consciences of men, that whatsoever they command must be obeyed, and whatsoever they forbid avoided, without respect to God's pleasure revealed in His Word, or else there abideth nothing for us but faggot, fire, and sword." They then noticed the cruel executions of their brethren, and declared that, although at the time they had neither defended these martyrs nor demanded a redress of their wrongs, they were now convinced that, as "a part of that power which God had established in the realm, it was their duty either to have protected them from such extremity, or to have borne along with them open testimony to their faith. It was evident," they said, "that abuses had now grown to such a head that a public reformation was necessary, as well in religion as in the temporal government of the state, and they therefore implored her grace and her grave council, whom they willingly acknowledged as the only authority placed in the realm for the correction of ecclesiastical and civil disorders, that she would listen to their requests, unless by God's Word it could be shewn that they were unjust, and ought to be denied.[2] The following requisitions were appended to the supplication; they were drawn up with force and clearness, and involved, if granted, a complete reformation. It was demanded, first, that the Congregation should be allowed to meet in public or in private, to hear common prayers in the vulgar tongue, that they might increase in knowledge, and be fed with all fervour and sincerity to offer up their petitions for the Universal Church, the queen, their sovereign, and her royal consort, the regent, and the whole estates of the realm. Secondly, That it should be lawful for any one present, who was well qualified in knowledge, to interpret any obscure passages in the Scriptures which should be read. Thirdly, That baptism and the Lord's supper should be administered in the vulgar tongue, and this last sacrament in both kinds, according to our Saviour's institution; and lastly, that the present wicked and scandalous lives of the clergy should be reformed, in obedience to the rules contained in the New Testament, the writings of the Fathers, and the godly laws of the Emperor Justinian—which three standards they were willing should decide the controversy between them and the Romish clergy.[3]

These proposals, and the supplication which introduced them, although expressed with apparent moderation, could not be viewed without alarm by the queen-dowager. The Lords of the Congregation acknowledged her indeed as the sole constituted authority within the realm, yet, with some inconsistency, they not only represented themselves as part of that power which God had established, but declared it to have been pusillanimous in them

[1] Keith, p. 78.

[2] Keith, pp. 78, 79. Knox's Hist., p. 127.

[3] Spottiswood, book iii. p. 119. Keith, p. 80. Knox, p. 129.

not to have actively interfered in defence of their brethren against the tyranny by which they had been oppressed. As barons of Parliament, they were certainly part of the established power in the realm; but to have defended their oppressed brethren by any faction or assembly out of parliament would have been unconstitutional and illegal. Again, when in their first petition they asked permission to use the common prayers in the vulgar tongue, we know, by certain evidence, that the service book of King Edward was here meant; but when they required that any lay person sufficiently learned should be allowed in their meetings to interpret obscure passages, they appear to have demanded a liberty unknown to the most zealous Presbyterians of the present day.

However unpalatable such requests might be, it did not suit the views of Mary of Guise to give them a decided refusal. The marriage between her daughter and the dauphin had indeed been concluded, but at this moment she required all the influence of the Protestant lords in parliament to obtain the crown matrimonial, and the title of king for the dauphin. When, therefore, the petition was presented to her at Holyrood House, by Sir James Sandilands, the preceptor of the Knights of St John, she received it with respect, promised them that their proposals should have her anxious consideration, and in the meantime assured them of her protection.[1]

Very different were the effects produced by this conduct on the Catholic clergy and the Lords of the Congregation. Grateful for her forbearance, and relying upon her promises, the Protestants abstained from all public exercise of their religion, and silenced one of their ministers who attempted to preach at Leith. But the Romanists arraigned the pusillanimity of the regent in condescending to temporise with heretics: and, in a convention which was held at Edinburgh soon after, loaded Erskine of Dun, who supported the claims of the Congregation, with mingled threats and reproaches.[2]

Yet, after further consideration, they made some advances towards a compromise. The terms, however, were such as the Protestants could not accept. It was insisted that the mass, purgatory, prayers to saints and for the dead, should remain parts of the established creed of the Church, which, if they granted, the reformers were to be allowed to pray and baptize in the vulgar tongue, provided these innovations were confined to their private assemblies.[3]

In the parliament which assembled at Edinburgh in December 1558—when, as we have already seen, the three estates received from the ambassadors who had returned from France an account of their proceedings—the leaders of the Congregation presented a supplication, to which they annexed some important requests, in their own name and that of their brethren. They desired that all acts of parliament by which churchmen were empowered to proceed against heretics should be suspended until the present controversies in religion were determined by a general council of the Church; and that, in the meantime, churchmen should be permitted only to accuse, but not to judge. Lest, however, this should seem to countenance licentiousness of opinion on sacred subjects, it was requested that all such as were accused of heresy should be carried before a temporal judge, should be permitted to speak in their defence, to state objections to witnesses, and to explain their own belief; nor ought they, it was added, to be condemned, unless proved by the Word of God to have erred from that faith which is necessary to salvation.[4] On presenting these articles to the regent, she exerted all her influence to avert their immediate discussion in parliament. This, she contended, would be followed by exasperation on the part of the clergy, which might be fatal to

[1] Knox's History, pp. 126, 130. M'Crie's Knox, vol. i. p. 236. Keith, p. 80.

[2] Keith, p. 80.

[3] Knox, pp. 129, 130.

[4] Keith, p. 81.

the attainment of those great political objects for which she and the Protestant lords were alike anxious. "Let them," she said, "but wait for a brief season, and all their wishes might be accomplished; but at present it was evident that such a debate as was likely to follow their introduction would be dangerous and premature."

Convinced by such a representation, or at least anxious to avoid all appearance of obstinacy or precipitation, the Lords withdrew their Articles, and contented themselves with presenting a protestation, which was read in parliament. In this solemn instrument they alluded to the controversy which had of late years arisen between those called prelates and rulers in the Church and the nobles and commons of the realm, regarding the worship of God, the duty of ministers, and the right administration of the sacraments; they had already repeatedly complained, they said, that their consciences were burdened with unprofitable ceremonies, and many idolatrous abuses, and it was their intention to have sought in this present parliament the redress of such enormities. This resolution the troubles of the time had compelled them for a season to delay. Yet, fearful lest their silence should be misinterpreted, they now protested that since they could not at present obtain a just reformation, it should be lawful for them to use themselves in matters of religion and conscience as they must answer to God, and in the true faith which is grounded upon Holy Scripture: and this without incurring any danger of life and lands, for the neglect or contravening of such acts as had been passed in favour of their adversaries. In conclusion, they declared that no blame ought to attach to them if any tumult or uproar should arise among the subjects of the realm on account of diversity of religion, or if it happened that those abuses which had been so long neglected should at last be summarily or violently reformed.[1] It is obvious, from the terms of this energetic paper, that the Congregation felt their own strength, and did not shut their eyes to those calamitous results in which a continuance of religious persecution might possibly involve the country. They were anxious for a quiet and temperate reform of those ceremonies which they alleged did violence to their conscience, and it was their wish to see removed, without any public tumult, the general profligacy which degraded the hierarchy; but it is also evident that they foresaw the probability of resistance, and were prepared to meet it; nor were they to be terrified into a renunciation of their belief by the prospect of any sufferings which awaited themselves or their country. They had prepared themselves for the worst—and it was fortunate they had done so, for at this crisis the accession of Elizabeth to the throne, and the alteration in the policy of the Guises, produced a sudden revolution in the mind of the queen-regent.

This princess, to resume the course of our history,[2] was now possessed of the great objects to which all her efforts had been so long directed. She had obtained the supreme power; her daughter the queen was married to the dauphin, and the title of King of Scotland, and the crown matrimonial, had been solemnly conferred upon him by the Scottish parliament. For the attainment of these objects, she had been greatly indebted to the assistance of the Protestant leaders. But she was also under obligations to France, especially to her brothers, the princes of the house of Guise; and these ambitious and unscrupulous men now claimed as a return that she should join that league for the destruction of the Protestants, and the re-establishment of the Roman Catholic faith in Europe, to which they had become parties with the Pope, the King of Spain, and the Emperor. As one part of their vast and unprincipled design, it was necessary to put down the Reformation in Scotland, and to secure the French ascendency in that country;

[1] Spottiswood, pp. 120, 121. Knox, pp. 133, 134.

[2] See *supra*, p. 75.

and having accomplished this, they trusted it would be no difficult matter to expel Elizabeth from the throne, to place the crown on the head of Mary, the young Queen of Scotland, whom they had already induced to assume the title of Queen of England, and under her to unite the two kingdoms in the profession of the ancient faith.

These plans, and her expected co-operation in them, were communicated to the queen-regent, by Monsieur de Bettancourt, who arrived in Scotland on a mission from the King of France, soon after the conclusion of the peace of Cambrai.[1] The disposition of Mary of Guise was inclined to moderate measures, and being attached to some of the leaders of the Protestants, to whose abilities and friendship she had been indebted, it was not without emotion and regret that she received the proposals of France. But she was deeply attached to the Roman Catholic faith; she had been educated in a profligate court; her brothers, the cardinal and the duke, had acquired an extraordinary influence over her mind; the great body of the Papal clergy in Scotland urged upon her the necessity of adopting decided measures to check the rapid growth of heresy; and, after a feeble and unsuccessful remonstrance with the court of France, she abandoned her better resolutions, and resigned herself to the entire direction of the Guises.

This fatal change in the policy of the queen-regent was followed by an immediate collision between the Protestant and the Catholic parties. In a convention of the clergy which assembled at Edinburgh, (March 1559,) the Lords of the Congregation presented a petition, in which, in addition to their former demands, they now insisted that bishops should be elected with consent of the gentlemen of the diocese, and parish priests by the votes of the parishioners. To these they not only received a decided refusal, but the Synod, contrary to the spirit of improvement and conciliation exhibited in the preceding year, declared that no language except the Latin could be used in the public prayers of the Church without violating its express decrees, and offering offence to the majesty of God. Nor was this all: the queen, with a rigour for which it is difficult to account, issued a proclamation for conformity of religion; all were commanded to resort daily to mass; and in an interview with some of the Protestant leaders she exhibited to them the injunctions she had received from France, warned them of the peril in which they stood, and summoned the most distinguished among the reformed ministers to appear before a parliament to be held at Stirling, and defend themselves from the accusations which were to be brought against them.[2]

Alarmed by these rash and unwise proceedings, the Earl of Glencairn, and Sir Hugh Campbell, sheriff of Ayr, requested an audience, in which they delivered a strong remonstrance. But when they besought her not to molest their preachers unless their doctrine could be proved to be repugnant to the Word of God, she broke into expressions of reproach and anger, declaring that their ministers should be banished though they preached as soundly as St Paul.[3] Glencairn and Campbell calmly reminded her of the promises of toleration which she had made them. "Promises," she replied, "ought not to be urged upon princes unless they can conveniently fulfil them." So flagrant a doctrine was received by the Scottish Lords with merited indignation: to offer arguments against it would have been ridiculous; but they did not shrink from their duty. "If, Madam," said they, "you are resolved to keep no faith with your subjects, we will renounce our allegiance; and it will be for your grace to consider the calamities which such a state of things must entail upon the country."[4]

[1] Maitland, vol. ii. pp. 909, 910. Carte, vol. iii. p. 378. Melvill's Memoirs, pp. 77, 78, Bannatyne edit.

[2] Spottiswood, p. 120. Knox, p. 134. Keith, pp. 82, 83.

[3] Keith, p. 82. Spottiswood, p. 121.

[4] Ibid. Calderwood's MS. History, vol. i

The boldness of this language produced a return to calmer reason, and she appeared willing to avert the storm; but at this moment the reformed opinions were publicly embraced by the town of Perth, and the queen, in great disturbance, commanded Lord Ruthven, the provost, to suppress the alleged heresy. His reply was, "That he could bring the bodies of his citizens to her grace, and compel them to prostrate themselves before her till she was fully satiate of their blood,—but over their consciences she had no power." She upbraided him for his "malapert" reply; commanded Dundee, Montrose, and all other places which had abjured the ancient faith, to be ready to attend mass and profess their adherence to the liturgy of the Roman Catholic Church at Easter, and again summoned the preachers to appear at Stirling, to answer for their conduct, upon the 10th of May.[1]

It was at this critical season that the adherents of the Reformation received an important accession of strength by the arrival of Knox in Scotland, (May 2, 1559.) The remonstrances which he had transmitted to the Lords of the Congregation from Dieppe had produced the most favourable effects; and in obedience to the second invitation, addressed to him in the month of November 1558, he now came to take his part with Willock, Douglas, and other preachers, who, during his absence, had laboured, at the peril of their lives, for the establishment of the truth. He found the cause of the Congregation in a condition very different from that in which he had left it at the period of his retreat from Scotland in 1557. Then the seed had indeed been sown, and in some places begun to spring up; but the Catholic party were predominant, and "matters had not yet ripened for a general reformation."[2] Now the Protestant faith was espoused by large masses of the people, professed by the most powerful of the nobles, and in the event of attack it could look with some confidence to the countenance and support of England. But it acquired a wonderful accession of strength in the return of this bold, uncompromising, and eloquent adherent, who, without delaying in the capital, repaired directly to Dundee. Here, when he learnt the proceedings against the ministers, he earnestly required that he might be permitted to assist his brethren, and to make confession of his faith along with them,—a request which we may believe was readily granted.

It was now resolved by the leaders of the Congregation that they would accompany their preachers to Stirling, and the principal barons of Angus and Mearns took their journey for this purpose to Perth. They wore no armour, but declared, that they came as peaceable men, and solely to make confession of their faith, and to assist their ministers in their just defence.[3] Lest their numbers might create alarm, Erskine of Dun, a grave and prudent man, noted for his early adherence to the reformed opinions, leaving his brethren in Perth, went forward to Stirling, and requested an interview with the queen. On this occasion the regent acted with much dissimulation: she listened with apparent moderation; and when the envoy assured her that the single wishes of the Congregation were to be permitted to worship God according to their conscience, and to secure liberty to their preachers, she declared that if the people would disperse, the preachers should be unmolested, the summons discharged, and new proceedings taken, which should remove all ground of complaint. Relying upon this promise, Erskine wrote to his brethren, who were at Perth; their leaders sent home the people; and it was expected that peace and toleration would be restored. But with the removal of the danger the regent thought it politic to forget her promises; and, with a precipitation which was as treacherous as it was short-sighted, the summons

p. 310. British Museum, Ayscough, No. 4734.

[1] MS. Calderwood, British Museum, Ayscough, 4734, fol. 311.

[2] M'Crie's Life of Knox, vol. i. p. 192.

[3] MS. Calderwood, British Museum, Ayscough, 4734, fol. 311.

was continued; the ministers who did not appear were denounced rebels, and all were prohibited, under the penalty of high treason, from receiving or supporting them.[1] Enraged at such perfidy, the Laird of Dun withdrew indignantly from court; rejoined his brethren, who were still at Perth, excused himself for having too implicitly trusted a princess who, he was now convinced, was resolved upon their destruction, and warned them to prepare for those extreme measures which were meditated against them. His representations made a deep impression; and Knox seized the moment to deliver to the people a sermon against idolatry, with all that fervid and impassioned eloquence for which he was so remarkable. He described how odious this crime appeared in the sight of God; what positive commands had been given in Scripture for the destruction of its monuments; and concluded by a denunciation of the mass, as one of the most abominable forms in which it had ever appeared to ensnare and degrade the human mind.[2]

It is by no means clear that the preacher, or the leaders of the Congregation who supported him, entertained at this moment any intention of exhorting the multitude to open violence; on the contrary, the Congregation after the conclusion of the sermon quietly dispersed, and a few loiterers, or, to use Knox's expression, "certain godly men" alone remained in the church. Scarce, however, had the preacher retired, when a priest, with a spirit of hasty zeal, perhaps of ill-timed defiance, unveiled a rich shrine which stood above one of the altars, and disclosing the images of the Virgin and the Saints, prepared to celebrate mass. A youth, who had listened to Knox's exhortations, exclaimed that this was intolerable. He appealed to those who stood by, and conjured them not to permit that idolatry, which God had condemned, to be used in their despite and before their face.[3] The priest, indignant at the interruption, struck him, and he retaliated by casting a stone at the altar, which broke one of the images. In an instant all was uproar and confusion: those who till now had been only spectators, and whose minds, from the recent eloquence of Knox, were highly excited, broke in upon the shrine, tore down its ornaments, shivered it to pieces, and being joined by others whom the noise had attracted, demolished every monument or relic which they imagined to savour of idolatry in an incredibly short space of time, (May 11, 1559.) The confusion now increased, and they who had inflicted this summary vengeance being joined by the "rascal multitude," as Knox denominates them, rushed with headlong fury to the religious houses of the Gray and Black Friars. They seem to have found them deserted: no defence at least was made; and in a few hours these magnificent edifices were spoiled of their wealth; and their altars, confessionals, and every ancient and hallowed relic which adorned them torn down and defaced. The same fate was experienced by the Charterhouse or Carthusian monastery, a building of extraordinary strength and magnificence, of which within two days nothing was to be seen but the bare and melancholy walls. The first invasion or impulse appears to have been solely against "idolatry;" but although the preachers had been careful to warn their hearers not to put their hands to a reformation for covetousness' sake, the people, stimulated by the extraordinary wealth and luxury of the Gray Friars, began to spoil. No honest man, however, according to the words of Knox, was enriched to the value of a groat, "and the spoil was permitted to the poor." The probability seems to be that the poor took the liberty of helping themselves.[4] Nor was this ebullition of popular fury confined to Perth; the infection spread to Cupar, a small town which had embraced the Protestant opinions, and here similar excesses, though on a smaller scale, took place.

[1] MS. Calderwood, fol. 311. Keith, pp. 83, 84.
[2] MS. Calderwood, fol. 313, vol. i.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Printed Calderwood, p. 7. Spottiswood, pp. 121, 122. Knox, p. 136.

It was with feelings of deep resentment that the queen-regent heard of these violent and illegal proceedings. She lamented especially the destruction of the monastery of Carthusians, a royal foundation, and honoured by her as holding the ashes of James the First. In the first paroxysm of her anger she vowed vengeance against all who were connected with the disturbance, and declared her resolution to raze the town of Perth to the ground, and sow it with salt, as a monument of perpetual desolation.[1] These were not meant to be empty threats. She instantly summoned to her defence the Duke of Chastelherault, with Athole, and D'Osell, the French commander; she remonstrated with the leaders amongst the Congregation, who, though attached to the doctrines of the Reformation, were inimical to the excesses which had been committed; two of these, the Earl of Argyle and the Lord James, disclaiming all intentions of affording encouragement to rebellion, joined her with their forces; and on the 18th of May she advanced towards Perth, where the Protestants had begun to collect their strength. Soon after, they drew up three letters in justification of their proceedings. In the first, which was addressed to the queen-regent, they informed this princess that, although they had till now served her with willing hearts, they should be constrained, if she continued her unjust persecution, to take the sword of just defence. They were ready, they added, to obey their sovereign and her husband under the single condition that they might live in peace, and have the word of Jesus Christ truly preached, and His sacraments rightly administered. Without this they were determined never to be subject to mortal men. They declared that they were about to notify what they had done to their sovereign and the King of France; and they conjured her, in the name of God, and as she valued the peace of the realm, not to invade them till they had received their answer.[2] The second letter of the Congregation, which was a more elaborate defence, was directed to the nobility of Scotland. They knew, they said, that the nobles were divided in opinion: some regarded them as a faction of heretics and seditious men who troubled the commonwealth, and against whom no punishment could be too severe; others were persuaded of the justice of their cause, nay, had for some time openly professed it, and, after having exhorted them to the enterprise, had deserted them in their extreme necessity. To the first they alleged that none could prove such offences against them: all that they had done being in obedience to God, who had commanded idolatry and its monuments to be cast down and destroyed. "Our earnest and long request," they continued, "hath been, and yet is, that in open assembly it may be disputed, in presence of indifferent auditors, whether that these abominations, named by the pestilent Papists religion, which they by fire and sword defend, be the true religion of Jesus Christ or not? Now, this our humble request being denied us, our lives are sought in a most cruel manner; and ye, the nobility, whose duty is to defend innocents and to bridle the fury and rage of wicked men, were it of princes or emperors, do, notwithstanding, follow their appetites, and arm yourselves against us, your brethren and natural countrymen. . . . If ye think that we be criminal because we dissent from your opinions, consider, we beseech you, that the prophets under the law, the apostles of Christ Jesus after His ascension, the primitive church and holy martyrs did disagree with the whole world in their days; and will ye deny but that their action was just, and that all those who persecuted them were murderers before God? May not the like be true this day? What assurance have ye this day of your religion, which the world had not that day of theirs? Ye have a multitude that agree with you, and so had they; ye have antiquity of time, and that they

[1] Knox, p. 137. MS. Calderwood, vol. i. pp. 313, 314.

[2] Keith, p. 86. 22d May 1559.

lacked not; ye have councils, laws, and men of reputation that have established all things, as ye suppose; but none of all these can make any religion acceptable before God, which only dependeth upon His own will, revealed to man in His most sacred Word. Is it not then a wonder that ye sleep in so deadly a security in the matter of your own salvation?" To the second class, those of the nobles who had first espoused their cause, and now deserted it, they directed an indignant remonstrance. "Unless," said they, "ye again join yourselves to us, we declare, that as of God ye are reputed traitors, so shall ye be excommunicated from our society, and from all participation with us in the administration of the sacraments. The glory of this victory, which God will give to His church, yea, even in the eyes of men, shall not appertain to you; but the fearful judgments that apprehended Ananias and his wife Sapphira shall apprehend you and your posterity."[1] The spirit and contents of the third letter of the Congregation may be divined from its extraordinary superscription. It was directed, "To the generation of Antichrist, the pestilent prelates, and their shavelings within Scotland." It contained a tremendous anathema against those who in their blind fury had caused the blood of martyrs to be shed; it warned them, that if they proceeded in their cruelty they should be made the subjects of a war of extermination such as Israel carried on with the Canaanites; it arrogated to themselves the appellation of the congregation of Christ; it stigmatised their opponents as the offspring of the man of sin; and concluded by uniting, in a manner which none can read without sorrow, expressions of extremest vengeance and wrath with the holy name of God, and the gospel of peace and love which was preached by His Son.[2]

It was not to be expected that such violent measures should be attended with pacific effects; the army of the Protestants was inferior to their opponents, and the queen-regent, confident of victory, had disdainfully rejected all proposals of negotiation, when the arrival of Glencairn in the camp of the Congregation, at the head of two thousand five hundred men, induced her to hesitate. By the mediation of the Earl of Argyle and the Lord James a cessation of hostilities was agreed on. Both armies consented to disperse; the town was to be left open to the queen-regent; no person was to be troubled or brought to answer for the late changes in religion, termed by their authors the abolishing of idolatry; the religion begun was to be suffered to go forward; no Frenchman was to approach within three miles of the town; when the queen retired no French garrison was to be left within it; and in the meantime all controversies were to be reserved till the meeting of parliament.[3]

This treaty having been concluded, Willock, who had arrived with Glencairn, and Knox, who had remained at Perth since the demolition of the monasteries, sought an interview with Argyle and the Lord James, and upbraided them with their desertion of the brethren. They repelled the accusation with warmth, declared their steady attachment to the cause, but said that they had promised the queen to labour for peace, and that the terms which she had offered were too reasonable to be refused. If, however, she proved false to her word, they called God to witness that they would assist and concur with their brethren in all time to come.[4] Satisfied with this explanation, Knox ascended the pulpit. It was right, he observed, before they left the scene of their labours, that all men should be exhorted to constancy and thankfulness. It had pleased God to stay the rage of the enemy without the effusion of blood; but he added, with that discernment into human motives and character with which he was eminently gifted, that he was well

[1] Knox, pp. 139-141.
[2] Keith, p. 87.

[3] These conditions of the capitulation are in the express words of Knox, p. 146, and Spottiswood, p. 122. Hume contends that the articles of capitulation were not violated, but, as it appears to me, on insufficient grounds.
[4] Knox, p. 146.

assured the queen meant no truth, "that it became no brother to be weary or faint, since he was certain the treaty would only be kept till the regent and her Frenchmen became the strongest."[1]

Profiting by these warnings, the Lords of the Congregation before they separated framed a new bond or Covenant, in which it was agreed "to unite together" in doing all things required of God in His Scripture that might be to His glory, and to put away all things that dishonoured His name, and hindered His pure and true worship. They solemnly obliged themselves to defend the Congregation or any of its members when trouble was intended against them, and they promised in the presence of God to spare neither labour, life, nor substance, in maintaining the liberty of the whole brethren, against whatever person should trouble them for the cause of religion, or any other cause thereon depending. This agreement was signed by the Earls of Argyle and Glencairn, the Lord James, Lord Boyd, Lord Ochiltree, whose daughter Knox afterwards married; and Matthew Campbell of Taringhame.[2]

It was soon seen how necessary were these measures to the existence of the Protestants. They had left Perth on the 29th of May; that day the queen-regent entered the town; and, with the duplicity which Knox had anticipated, violated the promise which she had made. Chastelherault, D'Osell, and a body of French soldiers accompanied her; the chief magistrates who had been favourers of the Reformation were deprived of their authority; Charteris of Kinfauns, a man of profligate manners, was made provost; and many of the inhabitants abandoned their houses and submitted to a voluntary exile, rather than witness the re-establishment of that worship which they abhorred. It had been stipulated that Perth should not be left in the occupation of a French garrison; and the regent congratulated herself upon her ingenuity in observing the letter, whilst she broke the spirit of the treaty. A body of troops in the pay of France, though natives of Scotland, were intrusted with the custody of the town; and the princess, when reminded of her engagements, of which the real meaning could not be easily misunderstood, defended her conduct on the common and untenable maxim that no faith was to be kept with heretics.

These dishonourable proceedings, however, produced important effects, and were favourable to the cause they were intended to destroy. The Earl of Argyle and the Lord James, faithful to their promise, deserted the regent, and departed secretly to St Andrews. Lord Ruthven, the Earl of Menteith, and Murray of Tullibardine, disgusted at the hypocrisy with which they had been treated, accompanied them; and on receiving a summons from the queen-dowager to repair instantly to court on pain of her highest displeasure, they answered that they dared not, with a safe conscience, be partakers of the manifest tyranny which was committed by her and her council, the prelates, against their brethren who professed a like faith with themselves.[3] It was now no time for delay: letters were despatched by Argyle and the Lord James to the Lairds of Dun and Pitarrow, the Provost of Dundee, and others of their brethren, to assemble for the Reformation at St Andrews; and on the 4th of June they were joined, not only by many devoted brethren, but by Knox, who, in the short interval between this and the treaty of Perth, had preached with great success in Fife.

It is from this period of the assembly of the Protestants at St Andrews that we can discern the appearance of a new principle in their conduct. The defence of the country against the domination of the French troops, and the tyranny with which the regent wielded her military power, became a paramount object in their proceedings. They began to have a deeper insight than hitherto into the unprincipled schemes of France. In the efforts of

[1] Knox, p. 150.
[2] MS. Calderwood, vol. i. p. 324.
[3] MS. Calderwood, vol. i. pp. 325, 326, 333, 334. 1st June 1559.

the queen-regent to put down the Reformation they believed that they saw a determination to overthrow the liberties of the country; and there can be little doubt that, whilst this feeling added strength to those whose predominating motive was the establishment of what they believed the truth, it induced others to join them, who, under other circumstances, would have remained quiet spectators of the struggle.

The zealous spirit and popular eloquence of Knox now found daily employment, and was followed by violent effects. After a sermon at Crail, a small sea town in Fife,[1] in which he exhorted his hearers to die like men, or to live and be victorious in the great struggle in which they were engaged, the multitude demolished the altars and images in the church, and the same scenes were repeated after an equally stirring address at Anstruther, another sea portnot far distant.

But his greatest effort was reserved for St Andrews, the seat of the metropolitan of Scotland, and the scene which was associated in the mind of the reformer with his earliest labours and sufferings. The leaders of the Congregation, however, became apprehensive of the consequences which, in this centre of Romish pomp, might follow a public address. The archbishop, hearing that his cathedral was to be reformed, entered the town on Saturday evening with a hundred spears. He sent Colville of Cleish to inform Knox, that on his first appearance in the pulpit he should be saluted with a dozen culverins,[2] and the reformer was earnestly requested to be silent. But no persuasions of his friends, no threats of his enemies, could shake his resolution. He ascended the pulpit; chose as the subject of his sermon that portion of Scripture which describes our Saviour driving the buyers and sellers out of the temple, and delivered an address in his usual strain of familiar and indignant eloquence. Whatever may have been his sentiments, or those of the leaders of the Congregation, as to the first excesses of the people, it was now evident that Knox, in a spirit of erroneous and misdirected zeal, no longer doubted that it was their duty, as professors of the truth, to put down by actual violence the idolatry which he condemned; to hazard all the evils of civil war and popular commotion, rather than suffer the alleged abominations of the Romish Church and the tyranny of the French faction to pollute the faith and endanger the liberty of the country. Animated by this feeling, he drew a parallel between the abuses of the Jewish worship and the corruptions of Popery; he explained to the magistrates and to the commonalty that it was their duty to imitate Christ's example, and remove all monuments of idolatry; and so ready were they to follow his instructions, that the congregation sallied from the sermon to the monasteries of the Dominican and Franciscan orders, and, encouraged by their chief magistrates, levelled these proud and wealthy edifices with the ground.[3]

In the midst of this destruction the archbishop flew to the queen-regent, who lay with her Frenchmen at Falkland. Inflamed by his account of the riot, the regent gave instant orders to advance upon St Andrews; and as Argyle and the Lord James were but slenderly accompanied, she trusted to assemble an army and crush them before they could receive assistance. But here she was mistaken. On the first knowledge of their danger, men flocked in so rapidly that, to use Knox's phrase, "they seemed to rain from the clouds;"[4] and when the regent mustered her army, it was found that the Congregation, who had encamped on Cupar Moor, greatly outnumbered her. It was evident, too, that there were experienced officers amongst them. Their ordnance was judiciously placed, and the ground occupied by their horse

[1] Crail is on the coast, near the most eastern part of Fife.

[2] MS. Calderwood, vol. i. p. 325. Knox's Hist., p. 149.

[3] Keith, p. 91. M'Crie's Life of Knox, vol. i. p. 269.

[4] Knox, pp. 151, 152. MS. Calderwood, vol. i. p. 327.

and their infantry chosen with considerable military skill. Fearful of attacking them with an inferior force, the queen-regent again entered into a negotiation, and a truce of eight days was agreed on. It was stipulated that no Frenchman should remain within the boundaries of Fife, except the garrisons which, previous to the raising of the last army, lay in some of the coast towns; and that certain noblemen, appointed by the queen and council, should meet the leaders of the Protestants to decide on the best method for the restoration of peace to the country.

It was soon seen, however, that the single object of the queen-regent was to procure delay: no commissioners arrived at St Andrews, where the Lords of the Congregation for some days anxiously expected them. Accounts were brought in the meantime of the tyranny exercised by Charteris the provost and the garrison in Perth; and the Protestants, pitying the condition of their brethren, who had been driven from their houses to subsist on the charity of their friends, determined to assemble in force and expel the foreign troops from this city. Late events had taught them their own strength; habits of discipline, watchfulness, and active communication had been introduced by that sense of mutual danger which is the best instructor; and Sir William Kirkaldy of Grange, a soldier of great military experience and undaunted determination, had joined their party at this conjuncture. His accession was of much importance to the Congregation, and appears to have been the result rather of a wish to rescue his native country from becoming an appanage of France, than of a determination to overthrow the Romish faith. As early at least as March 1, 1557, he had expressed himself with the utmost indignation against the yoke of the Frenchmen, and had offered his services to restore Scotland to its former liberty, and to promote an amity with England.[1]

[1] Sir N. Wotton to Lord Paget, privy-seal, and Sir William Petre, principal secretary; MS. Letter, 1st March 1556-7, State-paper Office. French Correspondence, MS. State-paper Office, Sir William Kirkaldy to Sir William Cecil, 23d June 1559.

Intimation had been sent to the brethren (so the Congregation were generally termed by their ministers) to assemble in the vicinity of Perth on the 24th of June; and so strongly did they muster on the day appointed that a summons was instantly given to the town, charging the garrison to abandon it, and commanding the provost to open the gates and leave it free to the subjects of the realm. On his refusal, and after a vain attempt by the regent to procure delay, the batteries were opened by Lord Ruthven on the west, and on the east quarter by the citizens of Dundee. It was evident, after the first discharge, that resistance would be vain; and the garrison, having stipulated that they should march out with military honours, delivered the town to the Congregation on Sabbath the 25th of June.[2]

This success, owing to the strength and importance of Perth, at that time one of the few fortified towns in Scotland, was highly encouraging to the Protestants. On the day of the capitulation public thanksgiving was returned to God for their victory; England it was hoped would espouse their cause more openly, and Knox, whose work against female sovereigns, or, as he termed it, the "Monstrous Regimen" of women, had made him odious to Elizabeth, addressed a remarkable letter to Secretary Cecil, in which he endeavoured to deprecate her resentment. He intended to have enclosed at the same time an epistle to the queen herself, but this he delayed, owing to the sudden departure of the messenger. "I understand," said he, in that honest and undaunted style of writing, which was unacceptable to the courtly taste of the English secretary, "I am become so odious to the queen's grace, and to her council, that the mention of my name is unpleasing in their ears; but yet I will not cease

[2] MS. Calderwood, vol. i. p. 330. State-paper Office, Sir William Kirkaldy to Sir H. Percy, 25th June 1559.

to offer myself, requiring you, in God's name, to present to the queen's grace this my letter, smelling nothing of flattery, and therefore I hope it shall be the more acceptable. Why that either her grace, either that the faithful in her realm, should repute me as an enemy, I know no just cause. One thing I know, that England by me this day hath received no hurt, yea, it hath received, by the power of God working in me, that benefit which yet to none in England is known, neither yet list I to boast of the same: only this will I say, that when England and the usurped authority thereof was enemy to me, yet was I friend to it; and the fruit of my friendship saved the Borders in their greatest necessities. My eyes have long looked to a perpetual concord betwixt these two realms, the occasion whereof is most present, if you shall move your hearts unfeignedly to seek the same. For humility of Christ Jesus crucified, now begun here to be practised, may join together the hearts of those whom Satan, by pride, hath long dissevered: for the furtherance hereof I would have licence to repair towards you. God move your heart rightly to consider the estate of both the realms, which stand in greater danger than many do espy. The common bruit, I doubt not, carrieth unto you the troubles that be lately here risen for the controversy in religion. The truth is, that many of the nobility, the most part of barons and gentlemen, with many towns and one city, have put to their hands to remove idolatry and the monuments of the same. The Reformation is somewhat violent, because the adversaries be stubborn; none that professeth Christ Jesus with us usurpeth anything against the authorities, neither yet intendeth to usurp, unless strangers be brought in to subdue and bring in bondage the liberties of this poor country: if any such thing be espied, I am uncertain what shall follow."[1]

The Lords of the Congregation were now to discover that it is infinitely more easy to excite than to direct or to check the fury of the people. In the immediate vicinity of Perth was the ancient abbey church of Scone, regarded with peculiar reverence as the spot in which for many centuries the Scottish monarchs had held the ceremony of their coronation. Beside it stood the palace of the Bishop of Moray, a prelate of profligate life, and hated by the men of Dundee as a chief instrument in the martyrdom of Walter Miln. It was thought proper, therefore, that some "order" should be taken with him, and a message was sent by the leaders of the Congregation, requiring him to join them with his servants, otherwise they would neither spare nor save his abbey. He consented to this, and added that not only would he meet them with all his force, but vote with them against the clergy in parliament. But before this answer arrived the citizens of Dundee had seized their weapons, and rushed forward to the abbey, followed by Knox and their chief magistrate, who in vain attempted to restrain them. It was the earnest wish of the reformer and of the leaders of the Protestants to save both the palace and the abbey; and in this they at first so far succeeded that nothing but the images were pulled down. Argyle and Moray then drew off the multitude, and receiving intelligence in the evening that the queen-regent meditated to garrison Stirling, and pre-occupy the passes of the Forth, so as to prevent a junction between the northern reformers and their Lowland brethren, these two leaders made a rapid night march, took possession of the town, and, according to the expression then commonly used, purged it of idolatry. Their absence was fatal to Scone: some of the poor, in hope of spoil, and others with a lingering wish of vengeance, returned on the morrow and began to prowl about the abbey. The prelate in the interval had barricaded his mansion; his servants had armed themselves; and a citizen of Dundee approaching near the "Girnel" or granary, was thrust through with a

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 28th June 1559, St Johnston, John Knox to Secretary Cecil.

rapier by one, reported to be a son of the prelate. In a moment all was tumult; the air rang with shouts and cries of vengeance—the story flew to Perth—a multitude which no power could control attacked the ecclesiastical palace and the abbey—and within a few hours both were in flames:[1] many even of the most zealous of the brethren lamented this destruction, and Knox appears personally to have exerted himself to prevent it; but an aged matron who stood by viewed the scene with exultation and thankfulness. "Now," said she, "I see that God's judgments are just, and none can save where He will punish; since ever I can remember aught, this place hath been nothing else than a den of profligates, where these filthy beasts, the friars, have acted in darkness every sort of sin, and specially that most wicked man the bishop: if all knew what I know, they would see matter for gratitude, but none of offence."[2]

Although Argyle and the Lord James mustered only a small force at Stirling, the greater part of the army of the Congregation having returned to their homes, such was the terror inspired by the rapidity and decision of their movements, that on their advance to Linlithgow the queen-regent and the French forces evacuated the capital and retreated to Dunbar. The intelligence of this movement gave fresh spirits to the reformers, and having taken possession of Linlithgow, pulled down the images and destroyed the relics, they entered Edinburgh in triumph on the 29th of June 1559.

CHAPTER IV

MARY.

1559—1560.

THE occupation of the capital by the army of the Congregation was an event of great importance. It convinced the queen-regent that all hope of avoiding a civil war was at an end, unless she was prepared to agree to a total alteration of the established religion,—it was equally decisive on the minds of the reformers. In the eye of the law they had gone too far in resistance to dream of retreat, and considerations of safety urged them to press forward in the work which they had begun. It becomes an interesting inquiry at this moment what was the exact object which they proposed to themselves; and fortunately we have their own evidence upon the subject. In an original letter from Sir William Kirkaldy of Grange, one of the ablest leaders of the Protestants, written to Sir Henry Percy, the day after they entered Edinburgh, he thus speaks:—"I received your letter this last of June, perceiving thereby the doubt and suspicion you stand in for the coming forward of the Congregation, whom I assure you you need not to have in suspicion; for they mean nothing but reformation of religion, which shortly throughout the realm they will bring to pass, for the queen and Monsieur d'Osell, with all the Frenchmen, for refuge are retired to Dunbar. The foresaid Congregation came this last of June, by three of the clock, to Edinburgh, where they

[1] MS. Calderwood, vol. i. p. 331.

[2] MS. Calderwood, vol. i. p. 331. Keith, p. 93.

will take order for the maintenance of the true religion and resisting of the King of France, if he sends any force against them. . . . . The manner of their proceeding in reformation is this: they pull down all manner of friaries, and some abbeys, which willingly receive not the Reformation. As to parish churches, they cleanse them of images and all other monuments of idolatry, and command that no masses be said in them; in place thereof the Book set forth by godly King Edward is read in the same churches. They have never as yet meddled with a pennyworth of that which pertains to the Church, but presently they will take order throughout all the parts where they dwell that all the fruits of the abbeys and other churches shall be kept and bestowed upon the faithful ministers until such time as a further order be taken. Some suppose the queen, seeing no other remedy, will follow their desires, which is a general reformation throughout the whole realm conform to the pure Word of God, and the Frenchmen to be sent away. If her grace will do so, they will obey her, and serve her, and annex the whole revenues of the abbeys to the crown; if her grace will not be content with this, they are determined to hear of no agreement."[1]

At the same time that Kirkaldy directed this letter to Percy, with the object of explaining their real intentions, and quieting his fears regarding any hostile designs upon England, Knox addressed the English knight in the name of the whole Congregation. He entreated that through them a correspondence might be opened betwixt the faithful in both realms. "The troubles of this realm," says he, "you hear, but the cause to many is not known. Persuade yourself, and assure others, that we mean neither sedition, neither yet rebellion against any just and lawful authority, but only the advancement of Christ's religion, and the liberty of this poor realm. If we can have the one with the other, it will fare better with England; which, if we lack, although we mourn and smart, England will not escape without worse trouble."[2] Soon after this Kirkaldy had a private meeting with Percy at Norham. The interview took place with the concurrence and under the directions of Cecil; and the Scottish baron having explained more fully the intentions of the Protestants, returned to them with the grateful intelligence that England was disposed to favour their views, and to enter into a league with them, for the attainment of their designs. The news was received with much exultation; and Grange, in a letter addressed to the English secretary, declares that "all Europe shall know that a league made in the name of God hath another foundation and assurance, than pactions made by man for worldly commodity."[3]

There is every reason to believe that these letters contain an honest statement of the views of the Congregation. The establishment of the reformed religion in opposition to the Romish faith, the expulsion of the French troops from Scotland, and the conclusion of a league, offensive and defensive, with Elizabeth, were the great objects which they proposed to themselves. Nor, although they had agreed and acted upon the necessity of pulling down all religious houses which adhered to the ancient faith, were they as deeply inimical to prelacy at this moment as they became not long after. They used the service-

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Sir Wm. Kirkaldy to Sir Henry Percy, endorsed Cecil. Mr Kirkaldy to Sir Henry Percy, Edinburgh, 1st July 1559. Also, Cecil to Throgmorton. Forbes, vol. i. p. 155, and Lingard, vol. vii. p. 311.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Knox to Sir Henry Percy, Edinburgh, 1st July 1559.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Sir William Kirkaldy to Cecil, Edinburgh, 17th July 1559. Also, State-paper Office, Knox to Cecil, 12th July 1559, Edinburgh. See also, original draft, State-paper Office, 8th July 1559, Sir William Cecil to Sir James Crofts. ". . . In any wise do your endeavour *to kindle the fire*, for if it should quench, the opportunity thereof will not arise in our lives; and that the Protestants mean to do would be done with all speed, for it will be too late when the French power cometh. To a wise man few words serve. . . ." Also, Cecil to Mr Percy, 4th July 1559.

book of King Edward the Sixth,[1] an extraordinary circumstance when we consider the violent opposition raised by Knox against the same form of liturgy, only a few years before, at Frankfort. Their hands were clean from any appropriation of ecclesiastical property; and on condition that the regent gave her consent to a general reformation, they were ready to annex the whole of the abbey lands to the crown, to be employed in the support of the faithful ministers of the Church. Their great fear was the arrival of a new army from France; they were aware that the warlike levies in that country were preparing against them; they dreaded the desertion of some amongst themselves, whose poverty exposed them to corruption;[2] and they were so well aware of the extreme caution and parsimony which marked the policy of Elizabeth, that they could not look with much confidence to her assistance, either in men or money.

Still they did not despair. The people were in their favour; the most powerful amongst the barons had espoused their cause; and Cecil's politics, though timid, were decidedly opposed to the establishment of anything like a permanent French influence in Scotland.

The Congregation, however, had a formidable enemy in the queen-regent. Could she but temporise and procure delay, she reckoned with confidence on the arrival of a large auxiliary force from France; and former experience had shewn that against this the irregular feudal infantry, which the Scottish barons brought into the field, was unable to contend for any length of time. She spread reports that her adversaries contemplated not only an alteration of the established religion, but a more daring change; that their great leader, the Lord James, aspired to the crown; and that, under pretence of religious reformation, they sought to overturn the existing government.[3] A proclamation to this effect was made in the name of Francis and Mary, king and queen of Scotland:—It arraigned the Protestants of sedition; accused them of having seized the irons of the Mint, and of maintaining a correspondence with England; and commanded all, under pain of treason, to depart from the capital, which they had violently entered. It declared at the same time that the regent had already offered to call a parliament, in which, by the advice of the estates of the realm, a universal order in religion should be established, and in the meantime had given a full liberty of conscience to her subjects.

These representations produced a considerable effect. Arran, the late regent, now Duke of Chastelherault, fell off from the Congregation; others grew lukewarm in the cause, and the leaders trembled for the overthrow of their party. In a letter to the queen they repudiated, with more indignation than consistency, the charge of rebellion; declared they would, in civil matters, conduct themselves as obedient subjects; and professed their sole object to be the promotion of God's glory, the defence of their preachers, and the destruction of idolatry.[4]

An attempt was soon after made to compose matters by negotiation, and commissioners from both sides met at Preston in Mid-Lothian; but the regent insisted not only that she should have the free exercise of her mass, but that wherever she came the Protestant preachers should be silent. To the last condition, which they justly contended would leave them without a church at all, it was impossible for the Lords of the Congregation to agree; yet, fearful of coming to extremities, they prolonged the conferences, and evinced an earnest desire for peace. This, however, did not prevent them from sending a letter to Queen Elizabeth, and at the same moment a more impassioned epistle to Cecil. This crafty minister had comforted them

[1] This important fact, which is now set at rest, has been much disputed, and some able writers have come to a contrary conclusion.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Sir William Kirkaldy to Cecil, 17th July 1559, Edinburgh.

[3] Keith, p. 95.

[4] Ibid.

by promises of assistance, should they be invaded by any foreign power, and had requested them to explain fully the purposes for which they had taken arms. "Our whole purpose," say they in reply, "is, as knoweth God, to advance the glory of Christ Jesus, and the true preaching of his Evangel, within this realm; to remove superstition, and all sorts of external idolatry; to bridle, to our power, the fury of those that have cruelly shed the blood of our brethren, and to our uttermost to maintain the liberty of this our country from the tyranny and thraldom of strangers."[1] The minister of Elizabeth, however, had pressed them upon a delicate point: the allegation of the queen-regent that they intended not only a change of religion, but of government. Their reply is remarkable. "True it is," they observe, "that as yet we have made no mention of any change in authority, neither yet hath any such thing entered in our hearts, except that extreme necessity compel us thereto. But perceiving that France, the queen-regent here, together with her priests and Frenchmen, pretend nothing else but the suppressing of Christ's Evangel, the maintenance of idolatry, the ruin of us, and the utter subversion of this poor realm, we are fully purposed to seek the next remedy: to withstand their tyranny, in which matter we unfeignedly require your faithful counsel and furtherance at the queen and council's hands, for our assistance."[2] Along with these letters, Knox addressed an apologetic epistle to Elizabeth, in which he declared that her displeasure conceived against him was a burden so grievous and intolerable, that, but for the testimony of a clean conscience, he would have sunk in desperation.[3]

It did not suit the policy of Cecil, in the uncertain state of the contest between the reformers and the Catholic party, to grant them immediate assistance, still less did he wish to see them put down, and peace established; and with this object of delay he directed a remarkable letter to the Congregation, in which he incited them to continue the struggle, and to weaken their principal enemies, the Popish clergy, by despoiling them of their riches. "Ye know," said he, "your chief adversaries, the Popish kirkmen, be noted wise in their generation; they be rich also, whereby they make many friends; by their wit with false persuasions, by their riches with corruption. As long as they feel no sharpness they be bold; but if they be once touched with fear, they be the greatest cowards. In our first reformation here in King Henry the Eighth his time, although in some points there was oversight for the help of the ministry and the poor; yet if the Prelacy had been left in their pomp and wealth, the victory had been theirs. I like no spoil, but I allow to have good things put to good uses, as to the enriching of the crown, the help to the youth and the nobility, the maintenance of ministry in the Church, of learning in schools, and to relieve the poor members of Christ, being in body and limbs impotent. . . . But ye may say there is now no season to write of this: the present time requireth defence of yourselves. True it is—and this that I mentioned not impertinent thereto, and to me the more marvel,—that ye omit also such opportunity to help yourselves. Will ye hear of a strange army coming by seas to invade you, and seek help against the same, and yet permit your adversaries, whom ye may expel, to keep the landing and strength for others? Which of these two is easiest: to weaken one neighbour first, or three afterwards? . . . What will be the end, when these be

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, in the handwriting of Knox, signed by Argyle, Glencairn, the Lord James, Ruthven, Boyd, and Ochiltree. Edinburgh, 19th July 1559. Addressed to Sir William Cecil.

[2] Ibid. See also MS. Letter from the same lords to Queen Elizabeth; also in the handwriting of Knox, dated Edinburgh, 19th July 1559.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Knox to Elizabeth, 20th July 1559. This letter is printed in Knox's History, p. 226, correctly, with the exception of the date, which ought to be 20th instead of 28th July, and this brief sentence, which occurs about the middle of the letter, "going to mass under your sister Mary her persecution of God's Saints." This sentence is not in the original.

the beginnings? Will *they* favour you in Scotland that burn their own daily in France? What may the Duke's Grace there look for, when his eldest son was so persecuted as, to save his life, he was forced to flee France and go to Geneva, not without great difficulty; his second brother, the Lord David, now cruelly imprisoned by Monsieur Chevigny, one chosen out to shew cruelty to your nation; divers Scots of the earl's family put to torture, and, finally, all the duchy of Chastelherault seised to the crown. And to shew you their purposed tragedy, the young queen so sweareth, so voweth, so threateneth, to destroy all the house of Hamiltons, as it is beyond all marvel to see your old regent there so enchant the Duke's ears as to hear nothing hereof. God open his heart according to his knowledge." In the end, Cecil assured them, that although the peace so lately concluded with France made it a matter of difficulty to decide how they were to be assisted, yet that Elizabeth could not but favour their purposes, and would neither neglect them nor see them quail.[1]

Before this letter could arrive, conceived in too general terms to afford them any great encouragement, the regent, animated by the accounts she received of the daily desertions in the army of her opponents, advanced from Dunbar towards Edinburgh. The Lords of the Congregation found themselves too weak to defend the capital, and a truce was concluded between the two parties till the tenth of January. The reformers agreed to evacuate the town, deliver up the coining irons of the Mint, obey the regent, and abstain from all molestation of churchmen, or destruction of religious houses. The regent, for her part, permitted to the citizens of Edinburgh the free choice of their religion, gave full liberty of speech to the preachers, and promised that no persons should be molested, either in their persons or estate, on account of their faith. It was lastly stipulated, that no men of war, either French or Scots, should be placed in garrison within the town.[2]

Such were the conditions agreed on and signed by the Duke, the Earl of Huntly, and D'Osell, to whom the negotiation was intrusted by both parties. It is asserted, however, by Knox,[3] that these were not the articles to which the brethren consented; and before leaving the town they issued a proclamation, in which they artfully omitted everything which would have been prejudicial to their own party, and added some conditions not to be found in the written appointment.[4]

On neither side was this convention expected to lead to any permanent pacification. The regent was now in daily hopes of having succour from France; her representations of the state of Scotland had produced a strong sensation in that country; and Sir James Melvill, who had been brought up from early youth in the service of the constable, Montmorency, was sent from Paris on a secret mission into that country, to examine the state of parties, and ascertain whether the accusation of the regent, that the Lord James[5] aimed at the crown, had any foundation in fact. Melvill was, probably, from his connexion with the constable, predisposed to favour the cause of the Congregation; and the manner in which he executed his commission argues either extreme simplicity, or a predetermination not to seek the truth. On his arrival, repairing to the Lord James, he interrogated him whether he meditated any designs against the throne; and being assured by this able leader that nothing could be farther from his intention—his desire, and that of his associates, being only to obtain liberty of conscience,—the ambassador returned through England into France perfectly satisfied

[1] MS. State-paper Office, Original Draft in Cecil's handwriting, much erased and interlineated.—Endorsed, "Copy of my Letter to the Earls of Argyle, Glencairn, Prior of St Andrews, Lords Boyd and Ochiltree, 28th July 1559." See also Knox's History, pp. 225-228.

[2] Keith, p. 99. [3] Knox, p. 166.

[4] Keith p. 99. Knox, p. 166. And MS. Proclamation, State-paper Office, backed by Cecil, 25th July, Proclamation of the Congregation.

[5] This young and ambitious nobleman was the queen's natural brother, and afterwards the celebrated Regent Moray.

upon the subject.[1] That Moray at this moment encouraged any such daring project may be doubted, but certainly he was not likely to criminate himself upon so serious an accusation.

The death of Henry the Second of France took place during this mission, and on his return to France Melvill found the Guises triumphant, and nothing but threats of war and vengeance against the party of the Congregation in Scotland. Nor could this change of views remain for any time a secret in that country, or in the court of Elizabeth: the Protestant faction in France kept up an intimate and constant correspondence with their brethren in Scotland; Cecil, by his secret agents, was fully informed of the intrigues of the French cabinet; and both were prepared to watch and to resist, when necessary, the meditated designs, not only against the reformed opinions, but against England itself. Previous to their leaving the capital, in conformity to the late convention, the brethren proclaimed by sound of trumpet the conditions which they had accepted, and added, that if any of these should be violated the leaders of the party would assist their friends, as they had already done, with their whole power, and zealously contend for the glory of God, and the relief and defence of every member of the true Congregation.[2]

From Edinburgh the chiefs of the Protestants retired to Stirling, where, dreading the craft of their adversaries, who had endeavoured to sow jealousies amongst them, they entered into a new bond, by which they engaged that none of them should receive any message from the regent, without imparting it to the rest, and holding a consultation on the proposals it conveyed.[3] From the same city Knox was despatched to Berwick, where he had a secret interview with Sir James Crofts the governor.[4] It appears, from the original instructions committed to this indefatigable reformer, that his mission was almost warlike. He proposed to seize and garrison Stirling, provided the English would send money for the payment of the troops, describing it as "the key and principal place" which might separate the northern part of the kingdom from the south. He represented that some assistance by sea would be required for the safety of Dundee and Perth, and suggested the fortification of Broughty craig, to which work the barons in its neighbourhood, who were zealous for the cause, would give every assistance. He pointed out the necessity of the fort of Eyemouth being seized by England, to prevent its occupation by the French; and he required the queen's majesty to influence the Kers, Homes, and other borderers, in favour of their party. Under the term "comfortable support," which the Congregation looked for from Elizabeth, he explained that not only soldiers must be sent, and men and ships be ready to assist them if assaulted, but "that some respect must be had to some of the nobility, who were not able to sustain such households as now, in the beginning of these troubles were requisite,—the practice of the queen-regent being to stir up enemies against every nobleman, even in the parts where he remaineth." In plainer terms, the Scottish nobility, who had joined the cause of the Congregation, were anxious, like their predecessors under Henry the Eighth, to receive pensions from England. On such conditions the reformers, Knox declared, were ready to enter into a strict league with Elizabeth, to bind themselves to be enemies to enemies, and friends to friends, and never to agree with France without the consent of that princess; he lastly observed, that although the league was

[1] Melvill's Memoirs, Bannatyne edit. pp. 81, 82. Melvill arrived when the army was arrayed in order of battle on Cupar Moor. This was on the 12th of June 1559. See Keith, p. 91.

[2] MS. State-paper Office. Proclamation of the Congregation, Edinburgh, 25th July 1559. It is backed by Cecil, and dated 31st July 1559.

[3] August 1, 1559. Keith, pp. 100, 101,

[4] Knox came to Berwick on the 3d Aug. 1559, and on the night of the same day returned with Alexander Whitelaw into Scotland. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Sir James Crofts to Cecil, in cipher, with the decipher, dated Berwick, 4th Aug. 1559.

as yet only proposed to the Privy-council of Scotland, so anxiously was it desired by the whole barons, that they accused the council of negligence for having so long delayed it.[1]

In this mission, Knox, who was accompanied by Alexander Whitelaw, an adherent of the party, incurred considerable personal risk, their little convoy having been furiously attacked by the French garrison of Dunbar.[2] He returned, however, to Stirling in safety, but mortified by the cold and dilatory policy of Elizabeth, who, whilst she avoided giving them immediate assistance, did not scruple to throw suspicion upon their motives, and to act with an inconsistency and mystery which put them at fault. She addressed a letter to the queen-dowager, full of the most earnest wishes for the preservation of peace between the two countries; yet she accused the leaders of the Congregation of lukewarmness and inactivity, in not rising against her authority, expressing her astonishment that they had not more vigorously exerted themselves for the great objects they had in view. It was her desire, as far as we can discover it, to incite them to revolt against the established government, but herself to incur no expense or risk. In her instructions to Sir Ralph Sadler, whom at this time she determined to send on a mission into Scotland, he was directed to "nourish the faction betwixt the Scots and the French, so that the French may be better occupied with them, and less busy with England; whilst he was to explore the very truth whether the Lord James did mean any enterprise towards the crown of Scotland for himself or not."[3]

These strange delays and suspicions irritated the reformers; and their leaders, the Lord James and the Earl of Argyle, addressed letters of remonstrance to Crofts, governor of Berwick, and to Cecil, in which they complained of the treatment they had experienced. To be judged slow, negligent, and cold in their proceedings, gave them, they declared, great distress. "Ye are not ignorant, sir," said they, addressing Crofts, "how difficult it is to persuade a multitude to the revolt of an authority established. The last time that we were pursued our enemies were in number thrice more than we, besides that the castle of Edinburgh declared plain enemy to us at our uttermost necessity, which was one cause of our appointment. . . . Our strength, substance, and number being considered, we mean nothing but plain simplicity, and a brotherly conjunction without long delay, for we hate all doubles."[4] In terms equally strong, Knox, in a letter sent at the same time (6th August 1559) to Sir James Crofts, arraigned the delay and suspicions of the English Privy-council. "I must signify to you," said he, "that unless the council be more forward in this common action, ye will utterly discourage the hearts of all here, for they cannot abide the crime of suspicion; they will not trifle: but if they cannot have present support of them, they will seek the next remedy (not that I mean that ever they intend to return to France) to preserve their own bodies, whatsoever become of the country, which our enemies may easily occupy; and when they have so done, make your account what may ensue towards yourself."[5]

It was the policy of Elizabeth at this time to distress France through Scotland. The establishment of the Reformation, according to the model

[1] MS. Instructions, State-paper Office, 31st July 1559, in the hand of Knox. These Articles and Instructions appear to have been left by Knox with Sir James Crofts, to be shewn to Sir Henry Percy, whom he had no time to see; and to Cecil, to whom he thought it superfluous to write, having, as he says, opened the whole case to Sir J. Crofts. They have never been printed, and throw much light upon a period which, in Knox's own history, is perplexed and obscure.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Knox to Sir J. Crofts, 6th Aug. 1559.

[3] MS. Instructions, State-paper Office, 8th Aug. 1559. Backed in Cecil's hand, Sir Ralf Sadler.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, backed by Cecil, Earl of Argyle, and Prior of St Andrews to Sir James Crofts, 6th August 1559, Stirling. It is signed by both Argyle and Moray, but the body of the letter is in the handwriting of Knox.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Knox to Sir J. Crofts, 6th August 1559.

dictated by the stern anti-prelatical opinions of Knox, was not the aim to which she directed her efforts: she hated the man,[1] and considered the book which he had written against female government an audacious and inexpiable offence. No concessions or explanations could disarm her resentment; she forbade him to set foot within her dominions; and to his repeated applications that he might be permitted to preach in the north of England, Cecil, her minister, was compelled to turn a deaf ear. Nor is this any matter of wonder, when we consider that the individual attachments of this princess were strongly on the side of Romanism, and that Knox considered the Reformation in England as scarcely one remove from Popery. But although lukewarm in the cause of the Reformation, and desirous of peace with France, she was well aware of the gigantic schemes of ambition conceived by the house of Guise. Her jealousy had been roused to the last degree by the attack upon her right to the throne, and assumption of her arms and title, which had been early made by the Queen of Scots; and she dreaded the effect which the establishment of French influence and the overthrow of the party of the Congregation must produce upon the great body of her Roman Catholic subjects in England and Ireland.

Under these circumstances, without actually breaking with France, she encouraged the Protestants to revolt against the authority of the queen-dowager; and, in reply to their repeated applications for money, Cecil hinted in his letters, as we have already seen, that they ought not to neglect the opportunity now afforded them to strip the Romish Church of its pomp and wealth, and apply "good things to good uses."[2] It is important to attend to the reply made by the Lord James and Argyle (in name of the rest of the brethren) to such advice. "We are not ignorant," they said, "that our enemies, the Popish kirkmen, are crafty, rich, malicious, and bloodthirsty, and most gladly would we have their riches otherwise bestowed. But, consider, sir, that we have against us the established authority, which did ever favour you and Denmark both, in all your reformations; and therefore, that without support we cannot bring them to such obedience as we desire. The danger imminent by the army prepared against us in France, moved us first to seek your support, and after to send our other messenger, Maister Knox, with fuller instructions to Sir James Crofts, which we suppose ye have received.[3] . . . We have tempted the Duke by all means possible, but as yet of him have no certainty other than a general promise that he will not be our enemy. . . . We cease not to provoke all men to favour our cause, and of our nobility we have established a Council; but suddenly to discharge this authority[4] till that ye and we be fully accorded, it is not thought expedient."[5]

From this avowal it is evident that the intentions of the Congregation had undergone a material alteration. Some little time before[6] they had declared in their letter to Cecil that any alteration in authority, by which we must understand a revolt against the queen-dowager for the purpose of introducing a change in the civil government of the country, had not entered into their hearts, unless extreme necessity compelled them to it; their single purpose being to advance the glory of Christ, to remove superstition and idolatry, and to maintain the liberty of their country against the tyranny of strangers: the remonstrances and encouragement of Elizabeth had now effected an important

[1] Sadler, vol. i. pp. 569, 570. Also, Ibid., 532, 535.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, quoted above, (p. 103,) 28th July 1559.

[3] This alludes to the instructions quoted above in p. 104, dated 31st July 1559. MS. State-paper Office.

[4] "To discharge this authority:" the phrase appears to be equivalent to "the renunciation of their allegiance and setting up a rival government."

[5] MS. State-paper Office, 13th August 1559, Glasgow. Subscribed, your loving and assured friends, in the name of the rest.

[6] On the 19th July 1559.

change. They had earnestly laboured to seduce the Duke of Chastelherault from his allegiance, with a view, probably, of restoring him to the regency; they had established a Council; and only waited a full agreement with England to depose the queen-dowager from her authority, and substitute some more favoured individual of their own party in her stead.

Who this should be was a question which did not fail to present itself to the English court, and Elizabeth seems to have looked to two noble persons. The first was the Earl of Arran, eldest son to the Duke of Chastelherault, next heir to the crown after the young queen, and lately Captain of the Scottish Guard in France. Having embraced the opinions of the reformers, and engaged in intrigues with England, he had become an object of suspicion to the French government, which had stript him of his preferments, and was about to throw him into prison when he escaped to Geneva. It had early occurred to Cecil that the presence of this young nobleman in Scotland would be useful as a check on the influence of the queen-dowager. Letters were, therefore, sent to recall him home, and every means taken to persuade his father to resist the regent. In Elizabeth's instructions to Sir Ralph Sadler, when she was about to send him into that country,[1] this minister was directed to exhort the duke, for "preservation of the expectant interest which he hath to the crown if God call the young queen before she have issue, to withstand [resist] the governance of that realm by any other than the blood of Scotland." He was directed to quote the late example of the King of Spain, who, although husband to the Queen of England, committed no charge of any manner of office, spiritual or temporal, to a stranger; and of his father, Charles the Fifth, who governed his countries of Flanders and Brabant by their own nation; and to warn Arran that the French, under pretence of putting down the Reformation, would never be satisfied till they had subjugated the realm, and utterly extirpated his house.[2] Neither the duke, however, nor his son, the Earl of Arran, possessed abilities sufficient for the high and difficult part thus allotted to them. Chastelherault, timid, irresolute, and indolent, was content to be neutral, and coveted repose. On the other hand, Arran his son was willing enough to engage in any schemes which promised advantage to himself, and his ambition even aspired so high as to a marriage with the English queen; but the vigour, ability, and self-command requisite in the leader of a party were completely wanting in this young nobleman. Vain, passionate, and capricious, his designs were adopted without consideration, and upon the first appearance of difficulty abandoned with precipitation and disgust. All this weakness, however, was not yet discovered, and for the present he was employed and flattered with the hopes of advancement.

But Elizabeth, and, still more, her able minister, Cecil, had their eye upon another and a very different person,—the Lord James, natural son of James the Fifth, afterwards the noted Regent Moray, and regarded even at this time, when he had not completed his twenty-sixth year,[3] as the most influential leader in the Congregation. There is every reason to believe that his attachment to the principles of the Reformation was sincere, and that at first he proposed no other end in taking so prominent a lead than to procure liberty of conscience and the free exercise of his religion for himself and his adherents. But personal ambition and the love of power were deeply planted in his character; his mind was one of no ordinary cast; and when he began to busy himself in public life a very short period sufficed to make him feel his talents, and take pleasure in the eminence they conferred upon him. Educated for the Church, first in his

[1] 8th August 1559

[2] MS. Instructions. State-paper Office, 8th August 1559. Backed in Cecil's hand, Sir Ralf Sadler. Memorial of things to be imparted to the Queen's Majesty.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office. Randolph to Killigrew, April 1560. Backed by Cecil.

own country and afterwards at the schools in France, he acquired habits of study, and a cultivation of mind superior to the barons by whom he was surrounded. He had early attached to himself some of those able and unscrupulous men, who at this time were to be found in the profession of the law or in the Church—men who combined the craft and intrigue of civilised life with the ferocity of a still feudal age. But whilst he used their assistance, his own powers of application were so great as scarcely to require it; his acquaintance with European politics, superior to most of those with whom he acted, enabled him to transact business, and conduct his correspondence with uncommon clearness, brevity, and precision. His knowledge of human nature was profound: he possessed that rapid intuitive insight into the dispositions of those with whom he acted which taught him to select with readiness, and to employ with success, those best calculated to carry forward his designs; and it was his peculiar art to appear to do nothing, whilst, in truth, he did all. There was a bluntness, openness, and honesty about his manner which disarmed suspicion, and disposed men to unbosom themselves to him with equal readiness and sincerity; yet when the conference was ended, they were often surprised to find that the confidence had been altogether on one side; they had revealed their own purposes, and Moray, with all his apparent frankness, had betrayed none of his secrets. There is, perhaps, no kind of man more dangerous in public life than he who conceals matured purposes under a negligent and careless exterior; and if to this we add, that his talents in war were of a superior order—that he was brave, almost to rashness, that his address was dignified, and his countenance noble and kingly, we shall be at no loss to comprehend the extraordinary influence which such a man had acquired, not only over his own party, but in England and on the Continent.

It had begun to be whispered in France, as we have seen, and at the English court, that Moray aimed secretly at the crown. When Cecil drew up his instructions for Sir Ralph Sadler, he was directed to investigate whether the Lord James, whose power with the Congregation appeared to be daily on the increase, did really look so high; and it was added, "if he do, and the duke be found very cold in his own causes, it shall not be amiss to let him follow his own device therein, without dissuading or persuading him anything therein."[1] A letter written a few days after this by Knox to Sir William Cecil describes the condition of the reformed party, and their anxiety for assistance from England, in strong terms. "The case of these gentlemen standeth thus: that unless without delay money be furnished to pay their soldiers, who in number are now but five hundred, for their service bypast, and to retain another thousand footmen, with three hundred horsemen for a time, they will be compelled every man to seek the next way for his own safety. I am assured (as flesh may be of flesh) that some of them will take a very hard life before that ever they compone either with the queen-regent or with France; but this I dare not promise of all, unless in you they see greater forwardness to their support. To aid us so liberally as we require, to some of you will appear excessive, and to displease France to many will appear dangerous; but, sir, I hope that ye consider that our destruction were your greatest loss, and that when France shall be our full master (which God avert) they will be but slender friends to you. Lord Bettancourt[2] bragged in his credit after he had delivered his menacing letter to the prior,[3] that the king and his council would spend the crown of France, unless they had our full obedience. I am assured, that unless they had a farther respect they would not buy our poverty at that price.

[1] MS. State-paper Office, Aug. 8, 1559. Backed by Cecil, Sir Ralf Sadler.

[2] The Sieur de Bettancourt, ambassador from the French court. See postea, p. 110.

[3] The Lord James. He was Prior of St Andrews.

They labour to corrupt some of our great men with money; and some of our number are so poor, (as before I wrote,) that without support they cannot serve. Some they threaten, and against others they have raised up a party in their own country. In this meantime, if you lie as manacled, what will be the end you may easily conclude. Some of the council, immediately after the sight of your letters, departed, not well appeased. The Earl of Argyle is gone to his country for putting order to the same, and mindeth shortly to return with his force, if assurance be had of your support; and likewise will the gentlemen in these lower parts put themselves in readiness to enterprise the uttermost, if ye will assist with them: and therefore, in the bowels of Christ Jesus, I require you, sir, to make plain answer what they may lippen[1] to, and at what time their support shall be in readiness. Some danger is in the drift of time: in such matters ye are not ignorant. It was much marvelled that the queen's majesty wrote no manner of answer, considering that her good father, the most noble and most redoubted of his time, disdained not, lovingly, to write to men fewer in number and far inferior in authority and power, than be those that wrote to her Grace."[2] This concluding sentence is worthy of notice, for Knox evidently alludes to the correspondence of Henry the Eighth with the murderers of the Cardinal Beaton; and his expressions go far, I think, to intimate his approval of their conduct and of Henry's encouragement of them.

These strong representations had the desired effect. Sir Ralph Sadler was sent to Berwick for the purpose of managing the correspondence between the reformers and the English court.[3] He assured them of immediate pecuniary assistance, and carried with him £3000,[4] which Elizabeth directed to be applied with such secrecy and discretion as not to impair the treaties of peace lately concluded with Scotland.[5] On his arrival, he found a messenger from Knox, by whom he was assured that if the queen would furnish them with money to pay a body of fifteen hundred arquebuses, and three hundred horse, they would soon not only expel the French from Scotland, but achieve their whole purpose.[6] Some little time after this,[7] Balnaves, a zealous adherent of the Congregation, and an intimate friend of Knox, repaired privately to Berwick, where he held a long consultation with Sir Ralph Sadler, and fully explained the views of the Protestants. He assured him that the breach between them and the queen-regent was now incurable; that having advanced so far in their resistance, they must go forward with the matter or lose their lives; that whatever pretence they made, the principal mark they shot at was to introduce an alteration of the state and authority, to depose the regent, place the supreme power in the hands of the duke, or his son the Earl of Arran, and then enter into open treaty with England according to the exigency of the case. So well satisfied was Sadler with the representations of this zealous partisan, that he paid him £2000, to be delivered to the leaders of the Congregation for the maintenance of their troops, and assured him that some steps should be taken for the relief of Kirkaldy, Ormiston, Whitelaw, and others. These men, it appears, were in distress, owing to the sums they had already spent in this service, and to their pensions from

[1] To lippen—to trust.

[2] Original MS. Letter, State-paper Office, St Andrews, 15th August 1559, backed in Cecil's hand, Mr Knox. I have gone into greater length in this part of the History, which involves the causes and motives connected with the early annals of the Reformation, because many of the letters which I have given were unknown to Dr M'Crie, others have been printed in his Life of Knox, but incorrectly, with many passages omitted, (owing to his not having had the originals before him,) and the period, one of great importance, has been far too slightly treated by our general historians.

[3] 20th August 1559.

[4] As to the mode in which the money was to be advanced to the Protestants, see Sadler, vol. i. p. 439.

[5] Sadler's State Papers, by Scott, vol. i. pp. 392, 399.

[6] Ibid., p. 400.

[7] 8th September 1559.

France having been stopped since they had taken part with the Congregation.[1]

It happened by a singular coincidence that whilst these schemes for the advancement of Arran formed the subject of a midnight conference in the castle of Berwick, that young earl himself alighted at the gate only three hours after the entrance of Balnaves; but all was managed so secretly that both were for some time under the same roof without being aware of the circumstance. It was judged right, however, that they should meet, and after a brief but joyful interview Balnaves departed, under cover of night, to Holy Island; from which, carrying the money with him, he arrived at the head-quarters of the Congregation. Arran, having disguised himself, assumed the name of Monsieur de Beaufort, and passed into Teviotdale, from whence he was conducted to his father in the castle of Hamilton.[2] Yet all this was transacted, according to the express directions of Cecil, with such secrecy that for some time it was not known that he was in Scotland.[3]

This assistance from Elizabeth came very opportunely to enable the Congregation to resist the decided measures of France and the queen-regent. In the beginning of August, the Sieur de Bettancourt had arrived from the French court. He assured the queen that an army, commanded by her brother, the Marquis d'Elbeuf, would speedily embark for Scotland. He brought letters from the King and Queen of France to the Lord James, whom they regarded as the chief leader of the Protestants. They reminded him of the benefits he had received from France, upbraided him with his ingratitude, and threatened him with absolute ruin if he persisted in his rebellious courses. To these accusations Moray directed a temperate, though an insincere reply. He professed himself to be solely actuated by a zeal for the truth and the glory of God; and he declared for himself and the rest of the Congregation that, except upon the subject of religion, they would be faithful to their sovereign, and detested the crime of sedition.[4]

Preparations for war now rapidly advanced. In the end of August a force of a thousand men, under the command of an Italian officer named Octavian, had disembarked at Leith, and with these the queen-dowager began to intrench and fortify that port. She despatched their leader back to France, with an earnest request for a larger reinforcement; she warned the French court that her adversaries were in active correspondence with England, Germany, and Denmark; stated the necessity for immediate exertion before they were allowed to concentrate their strength, and assured them that, with four ships of war to cruise in the Firth, an additional thousand men, and a hundred barbed horse, she would undertake to reduce the kingdom to peace.[5] This, however, was not so easily effected. The people had been long dissatisfied with the French troops, whose stay in Scotland was expensive and troublesome. The partiality of the regent to her own nation had excited disgust; the reformed preachers perambulated the country, and in their discourses won the people to their devotion, not only on the great subject of religion, but so eloquently declaimed against the alleged conspiracy of the regent for the subjugation of the realm under a foreign yoke, that the arrival of a new auxiliary force was viewed with the utmost jealousy and aversion.[6] A more pacific mission, indeed, succeeded this warlike demonstration, consisting of the Bishop of Amiens and two learned doctors of the Sorbonne; but although this foreign prelate came as legate *à*

[1] Sadler, vol. i. pp. 434, 435. Arrival of the French, Sadler, vol. i. p. 403-411. Keith, pp. 101, 102.

[2] Sadler, vol. i. pp. 435, 450, 461.

[3] For Arran's arrival, 16th September, see Sadler, vol. i. p. 447.

[4] Knox, p. 167. Spottiswood, p. 131.

[5] Keith, p. 102.

[6] British Museum, Caligula, book x. fol. 38. MS. Letter, Henry Balnaves to Sir R. Sadler and Sir J. Crofts, Stirling, 22d September 1559.

latere from the Pope, and his companions earnestly laboured to reconcile the reformers to the ancient faith, their united efforts to "purge the church and the people from heretical pollutions" were unavailing. Nor was the legate completely a messenger of peace, for along with him came La Brosse, a French officer, two hundred men,[1] and a company of eighty horse.[2]

Both sides now resolved on war; and on the arrival of Arran a secret consultation having been held at Hamilton with the principal leaders of the Congregation,[3] the duke, who had hitherto been neutral, agreed to join their party, and signed those covenants by which they bound themselves to subvert the Roman Catholic faith, to overturn the government of the regent, and to expel the French from the country.[4] A message was then transmitted to the queen, requiring her to desist from the fortification of Leith; to which she answered with spirit, that it was as lawful for her daughter to strengthen her own seaport, without asking leave of the nobility, as for the duke to build at Hamilton, nor would she stay her proceedings unless compelled by force. This challenge on the part of the reformers was premature and ill-judged. They could not, at the earliest, assemble their whole force before the 15th of October; they were not certain of a second supply of money from England; the duke, although now one of their party, was timid and irresolute; Argyle was occupied in a struggle against Macconnell in his own country; and Huntly, although disposed to favour their proceedings, was not yet separated entirely from the queen-regent. Instead, therefore, of being able to follow up their warlike message by any hostile attack, they contented themselves with the occupation of Broughty Craig, a strong fortified castle at the mouth of the Tay, and granted a commission to Glencairn and Erskine of Dun to recommence their proceedings against the religious houses, by suppressing and purging the abbey of Paisley of idolatry.[5]

Soon after this their cause gained an important accession. Thomas Randall or Randolph, afterwards Sir Thomas Randolph, who had become acquainted with the Earl of Arran at Geneva, at the earnest request of this young nobleman was sent after him into Scotland. What was the particular tie which attached so able and busy an intriguer as Randolph to the fortunes of Arran, does not appear; but Cecil lost no time in seconding his wishes; and the presence of this English agent, who arrived with much secrecy at Hamilton in the end of September,[6] was of essential service in imparting energy and promptitude to the measures of the reformers. But this was not all: Maitland of Lethington, the secretary to the queen-regent, a man whose talents as a statesman were of the highest order, and who had long professed himself a friend to the reformed doctrines, now secretly joined their party; and although he openly adhered to the queen, betrayed her councils and most private affairs to her enemies.

Matters now proceeded with more decision and rapidity.[7] On the 15th of October the Congregation assembled their force. It amounted to twelve thousand men, and next day they advanced to Edinburgh, which they occupied without resistance, the regent having retired within the fortifications of Leith. One council for civil affairs and another for matters of religion were then appointed.[8] In the first were included the duke, his son

[1] Sadler, State Papers, vol. i. pp. 417, 464, 470, 475.

[2] They arrived in three ships on 24th September 1559. Caligula, book x. fol. 39. Sadler and Crofts to Cecil, Berwick, Sept. 27, 1559.

[3] See an important letter in Mr Stevenson's Illustrations of the Reign of Mary, p. 73. Arran to Sir William Cecil, 21st September 1559.

[4] MS. Letter, British Museum, Caligula, book x. fol. 38. Henry Balnaves to Sadler and Crofts, 22d September 1559.

[5] Sadler, vol. i. p. 465. Also, pp. 500, 507.

[6] Ibid., p. 474.

[7] Ibid., p. 498. MS. Calderwood, vol. i. p. 383.

[8] Original, State-paper Office, backed by Cecil, 10th November 1559. Intelligence out of Scotland.

the Earl of Arran, the Earls of Argyle and Glencairn, the Lord James, with the Lords Ruthven, Boyd, Maxwell, the Laird of Dun, Henry Balnaves, Kirkaldy of Grange, and the Provost of Dundee. The second for religion embraced Knox, Goodman, and the Bishop of Galloway, who had renounced his former faith, and embraced the principles of the Protestants. They next addressed a letter to the queen, requiring her instantly to command all foreigners and men-at-arms to depart from the town of Leith, and leave it free and open to the subjects of the realm. She replied that their letter appeared, from its tone, rather to come from a prince to his subjects than from subjects to a prince; that it was ridiculous to talk of foreigners making a conquest of the realm, since Frenchmen were naturalised subjects, and Scotland united to France by marriage; and she concluded by commanding the duke and his company, under pain of treason, to depart from the capital.

The Lord Lion, who brought this message from the queen, was requested to await his answer; and the whole Congregation, consisting of the nobles, barons, and burgesses of their faction, assembled in the Tolbooth of the city on the 21st of October.

At this meeting the question of the deposition of the regent was debated with much solemnity. It was urged by Lord Ruthven, who was chosen president, that since she, who was not their natural born sovereign, but only a regent, had contemptuously refused the requests of those who by birth were councillors of the realm, and since her pretences threatened to bring the commonwealth into bondage, she ought no longer to be permitted to domineer over them: he proposed, therefore, that she should be deposed; and much diversity of opinion having been expressed, they requested the advice of their preachers.

On this delicate subject much thought and discussion had already taken place. We have seen, indeed, that the deprivation of the queen, and the alteration of the civil government, had been contemplated some time before. Willock spoke first, and having enlarged on the Divine Ordinance of Magistracy, he stated its limitations by the Word of God, and quoted the examples of the depositions of kings which occurred in the Scriptures; he then adverted to the oppression inflicted on them by the queen-regent, whom he denominated an open and obstinate idolatress. She had refused them justice, she had invaded their liberties, she had prevented the preaching of God's Word, and had not scrupled to declare that their country was no longer a free and independent realm, but an appanage of France. Such being her conduct, he could see no reason why they, the born councillors of the realm, should scruple to divest her of all authority amongst them.[1] This judgment was corroborated, though somewhat more guardedly, by Knox. He approved, he said, of the sentiments of his brother, but warned them that no malversation of the regent ought to withdraw their hearts from the obedience due to their sovereigns, and protested that they ought deeply to examine their own motives. If, he said, the present grave and momentous proceeding originated not from the desire to preserve their commonwealth, but was dictated by private malice and envy, they need not expect to escape the wrath of God; and lastly, he observed that, upon her repentance and submission to the nobility, they were undoubtedly bound to restore her to the same honours of which she was now deprived.[2] Such being the decision of their ministers, the votes of the assembly were individually taken: it was resolved without a dissenting voice, that the regent should be suspended from her authority, and the act for this purpose was immediately drawn up, and proclaimed publicly to the people.[3] It remained only to communicate it to the regent; and for this purpose a letter was ad-

[1] Keith, pp. 104, 105.

[2] MS. Calderwood, vol. i. pp. 386, 387; and British Museum, Caligula, book x. fol. 42.

[3] 22d October 1559.

dressed to her and delivered to the Lion herald. It informed her that they had received her message, and understood from the terms in which it was conceived her determined opposition to the glory of God, the liberty of the realm, and the welfare of the nobles; for saving of which, it continued, we have in our sovereign lord and lady's name suspended your commission, and all administration of the policy your grace may pretend thereby; being most assuredly persuaded that your proceedings are direct contrary to our sovereign lord and lady's will, whom we ever esteem to be for the weal and not for the hurt of this our commonweal. And, it proceeded, "as your grace will not acknowledge us, our sovereign lord and lady's true barons, for your subjects and council, no more will we acknowledge you for any regent or lawful magistrate unto us. Seeing, if any authority ye have, by reason of our sovereign's commission granted unto your grace, the same for most weighty reasons is worthily suspended by us, by name and authority of our sovereigns, whose council we are, of native birth, in the affairs of this our commonweal."[1]

It must be admitted that this violent and unprecedented measure, although attempted to be concealed under the name and authority of the sovereign, was an act of open rebellion, and that to attempt to justify their proceedings under the allegation that they were born councillors of the realm was a specious but unsound pretence. Their birth entitled some of them to sit in parliament, but could never bestow upon them the power to constitute themselves a self-elected council, without the intervention of the royal authority or any meeting of the three estates. Having, however, thus boldly begun, it was judged right to proceed in the same strain. On the 25th a herald was sent to summon all French and Scottish soldiers to leave the town of Leith, within twelve hours. This being disregarded, preparations were made for the assault, and scaling ladders were ordered to be prepared in the aisles of the High Church of St Giles, much to the annoyance of the preachers, who predicted that an enterprise begun in sacrilege must end in defeat.[2] Nor was it long before these gloomy anticipations were fulfilled: the money given to Balnaves, and a small additional sum brought by Randolph, was now spent; the soldiers of the Congregation clamoured for pay, and breaking into mutiny, offered their services to any Catholic or Protestant master who would pay them their wages; the army, lately twelve thousand strong, but composed of inferior vassals, who could not remain long in the field, diminished daily; consternation seized the minds of their leaders; and it was evident that, without additional assistance, their great enterprise was at an end. To comfort them, Elizabeth, at the earnest entreaties of Cecil, forgot her parsimony, and intrusted four thousand pounds to Cockburn of Ormiston, a zealous adherent of the cause, who undertook the dangerous commission of carrying it to head-quarters; but he was waylaid, wounded, and robbed of the whole by the Earl of Bothwell, and the Congregation thrown into extreme distress.[3] The action was the more treacherous, as Bothwell, afterwards so notorious for his crimes, was at this moment in secret correspondence with the reformers, and had professed attachment to their cause. To this succeeded another calamity: Haliburton, provost of Dundee, and reputed one of the best military leaders in the country, conducted a party of his townsmen to besiege Leith, and had planted some great ordnance on an eminence near Holyrood. During the absence of many of the leaders of the Congregation, who had gone to the sermon, which lasted till noon, the French

[1] Keith, p. 105.

[2] Knox, p. 200. British Museum, Caligula, book x. fol. 47, dorso. The Scottish Lords to Sir Ralph Sadler, 6th November 1559.

[3] Sadler's State Papers, pp. 538, 539. MS. Calderwood, vol. i. p. 393. MS. State-paper Office, Intelligence out of Scotland, 10th November 1559.

attacked the battery, and defeating his party with great loss, pursued them into the streets of the city, where they had the cruelty to slay not only several aged persons who could make no resistance, but to murder a woman in cold blood, with an infant at her breast.[1] On their return to Leith the queen-regent, sitting on the ramparts, welcomed her victorious soldiers, and smiled to see them loaded with the homely and multifarious plunder of the houses of her poor citizens. We cannot wonder that the popularity of this princess was on the wane, yet her affairs continued to prosper; and her enemies, divided in opinion and despairing of support, became weakened by desertion and spiritless in their exertion. On the 5th of November, the French sallied from Leith, with the purpose of intercepting a convoy carrying provisions into Edinburgh. Arran and the Lord James attacked them at the head of a small company; but pushing into difficult ground, they got entangled between the morass of Restalrig and the moat surrounding the park, and falling into confusion, were defeated with great loss. Haliburton, to whose exertions it was owing that they were not entirely cut to pieces, fell in this action; and although the Lord James and Arran escaped, its consequences were so fatal that the Congregation abandoned the town at midnight, and retired precipitately, first to Linlithgow and afterwards to Stirling.[2] The capital had generally been esteemed peculiarly favourable to the reformers; but the late disasters cooled the ardour of many of their proselytes, and they retreated amidst the shouts and insults of a great proportion of the citizens.[3]

At this season of trial and distress, the courage and eloquence of Knox wonderfully supported his party. Whilst yet in Edinburgh he had commenced a sermon on the 80th Psalm, in which he demonstrated that the felicity of God's people was not to be measured by external appearances, since, in the course of their history, it had often happened that his chosen flock suffered more severely than the ignorant and idolatrous heathen. At Stirling he continued the subject; warned the Congregation of their sin in trusting too much to an arm of flesh; reminded them of their humility and holiness, when, at the commencement of this great struggle, they had only God for their protector; and bade them beware lest they had more respect to the power and dignity of their leader, the duke, than to the favour of Heaven and the equity of their cause. Passing from this to a personal exhortation, he reproached Chastelherault with his slowness to join the reformers, and pointed out the sin he had committed in giving assistance to their enemies. "I am uncertain," said he, "if my lord's grace hath unfeignedly repented of his assistance given to the murderers who unjustly pursued us; I am uncertain if he hath repented of the innocent blood of Christ's martyrs, which was shed through his default. But let it be that so he hath done, (as I hear he hath confessed his offence before the Lords and brethren of the Congregation,) yet sure I am that neither he nor his friends did feel before this time the anguish and grief of heart which we felt when their blind fury pursued us; and therefore hath God justly permitted both them and us to fall in this confusion—us, because we put our confidence in man; and them, to make them feel how bitter was that cup which they had made others to drink before them. What then remaineth, said he, but that both they and we turn to the Eternal, our God, who beateth down to death, that He may raise up again, to leave behind the remembrance of His wondrous deliverance to the praise of His own name, which, if we do unfeignedly, I no more doubt that this our dolour, confusion, and fear shall be

[1] MS. Calderwood, vol. i. p. 394.
[2] 6th November 1559.
[3] MS. Calderwood, pp. 399, 400. Sadler, vol. i. p. 554. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 10th November 1559, Intelligence out of Scotland. Also, MS. State-paper Office, Randolph to Sir Ralph Sadler, 11th November 1559.

turned into joy, honour, and boldness than I doubt that God gave victory to the Israelites over the Benjamites, after they were twice with ignominy repulsed and driven back. Be assured, he concluded, with that fervour of expression and manner which gave weight and entrance to every syllable—this cause, whatever becomes of us and our mortal carcases, shall, in despite of Satan, prevail in this realm of Scotland: it is the eternal truth of God; and, however for the time oppressed, must in the end be triumphant."[1]

Animated by this address, the leaders met in council, and after prayer by Knox it was resolved instantly to despatch Maitland of Lethington to solicit assistance from Elizabeth; at the same time, being unable to keep the field, they determined, till an answer arrived from England, to separate into two parties. The Duke, with the Earl of Glencairn, and the Lords Boyd and Ochiltree, remained at Glasgow with their friends, for the comfort and defence of the brethren; Arran, the Lord James, the Earl of Rothes, the Master of Lindsay, and their adherents, continued in Fife;[2] and it was resolved that on the 16th of December a convention should be held at Stirling, with the view of deciding upon more active operations.

On the retreat of the Protestants from the capital the town was immediately occupied by the queen-regent, but all her attempts to procure possession of the castle were unavailing. Its governor, Lord Erskine, declared that, as it had been committed to his charge by the parliament of Scotland,[3] nothing but an order of the same great council would induce him to surrender it; and although alternately flattered and threatened by both parties, he appears honestly to have kept his resolution. Yet it was evident that the regent had gained important ground; her successes imparted confidence to her soldiers; and the news having been carried to France, great preparations were made to send such a force into Scotland as should at once crush the Congregation and put an end to the war.

But Elizabeth became at length convinced that such a result would weaken the power and endanger the tranquillity of England; nor could the reformers have selected a more able envoy than Maitland of Lethington to confirm her in this idea.[4] He represented to her, in strong terms, the impossibility of their being able to cope with the veteran troops of France, unless she supported them by an open demonstration in their favour, and sent a naval and military force to their assistance. The great difficulty lay in the circumstance that both countries were at peace, and that any active co-operation with the reformed faction would justly be considered as an open declaration of war. Some time before this[5] Knox had suggested to Sir James Crofts, the governor of Berwick, a crafty political expedient, by which a thousand or more men might, without breach of league with France, be sent to their assistance in Scotland.[6] It was free, he said, for English subjects to serve any nation or prince in war who paid their wages; and if this was questioned, he recommended that Elizabeth should first send the auxiliaries into Scotland, and then declare them rebels after they had embraced the service of the Congregation.[7] Crofts either was, or affected to be, shocked by such advice at the time:[8] but on the arrival of Maitland at the English court, his representations of the desperate condition of the affairs of the Protestants induced Elizabeth and her council to adopt a line of policy essentially the same as that recommended by the reformer. It was resolved to enter into an agreement or league with the

[1] Knox's History, p. 210.
[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Balnaves to Cecil, 19th Nov. 1559.
[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 10th December 1559, Alexander Whitelaw to Cecil.
[4] Sadler, vol. i. p. 565.
[5] On the 25th October 1559.
[6] British Museum, Caligula, book x. fol. 43. Knox, under the feigned name of John Sinclair to Crofts, 25th October 1559.
[7] Keith, Appendix, pp. 39-41.
[8] Sadler, vol. i. pp. 523, 524.

leaders of the Congregation, the terms of which were to be discussed in a secret meeting of commissioners from both countries, to be held at Berwick. Preparations at the same time were made for the equipment of a fleet, which was to cruise in the Firth; and orders were given to assemble an army, which might co-operate with the reduced forces of the Protestants. This grateful intelligence was brought to the reformers on the 15th of December, by Robert Melvill, who, along with Randolph, had accompanied Lethington to the English court, and enjoyed the confidence of Elizabeth.[1]

It is curious to observe the extraordinary circumspection and care used by the English queen in the steps which she now took. She transmitted to the reformers exact directions regarding the manner in which they were to apply to her for relief. The instructions to Lethington, when he took his journey to the English court, were drawn up in strict conformity to a paper sent by Cecil; and special pains were taken that in the application which they made there was no mention of religion. The single ground upon which they entreated succour from England was the tyranny of France, the evident intention of that kingdom to make a conquest of Scotland, and ultimately to dispossess Elizabeth of the throne.[2] "Most true it is," say they, "that this practice of the French is not attempted only against this kingdom of Scotland, but also against the crown and kingdom of England and Ireland; for we know most certainly that the French have devised to spread abroad, though most falsely, that our queen is right heir to England and Ireland; and, to notify the same to the world, have, in paintings at public jousts in France and other places, this year caused the arms of England, contrary to all right, to be borne quarterly with the arms of Scotland, meaning nothing less than any augmentation to Scotland, but to annex them both perpetually to the crown of France."[3] We have here a strong presumption that Elizabeth was inimical to what she esteemed the ultra-Protestant Reformation established in Scotland; nor can it be denied that this transaction presents us with a somewhat mortifying view of the early reformers in this country, when we find that after all the solemn warnings denounced against trusting too exclusively to an arm of flesh, Knox, who then acted as secretary to the council of the congregation in the west, and Balnaves, who filled the same situation in the council established at Glasgow, consented to purchase the co-operation of mere human power, by omitting all allusion to that great cause of religious reformation which they had so repeatedly represented as the paramount object for which they had taken up arms, and were ready to sacrifice their lives.

During the interval occupied by the mission of Lethington to England, neither party was idle. The queen-dowager eagerly availed herself of the advantages she had gained. She despatched Monsieur de Rubay to remonstrate with Elizabeth against the support which she had given to her rebellious subjects:[4] she occupied the capital, and afterwards carried the war into Fife, where she exerted herself to disperse and defeat the little band there commanded by Arran and the Lord James. These leaders, however, who had gained in military experience, were able to keep the French in check; and a seasonable supply of money, which they received early in December, communicated fresh spirits to their party, and encouraged them to levy an additional force of one thousand foot and two hundred horse.[5] At Glasgow the duke confined

[1] Sadler, vol. i. p. 647. Also, British Museum, Caligula, book x. fol. 57. MS. Instructions to Winter.

[2] Sadler, vol. i. p. 569.

[3] This sentence is, in great part, a transcript of the instructions drawn up by Elizabeth. See Sadler, p. 570.

[4] MS. Letter, draft by Cecil, State-paper Office. Queen Elizabeth to the Queen-dowager, 28th November 1559. See also Mr Stevenson's Illustrations, p. 78. The Lord James to Sir R. Sadler and Sir J. Crofts, Nov. 17, 1559. Also, Caligula, British Museum, book x., 53 dorso.

[5] Sadler, vol. i. pp. 631, 632.

his efforts to what was termed the "abolition of idolatry." His reformation, however, was one of a very active and violent description. Not only did he cause all the images, altars, and relics within the churches to be pulled down, but he attacked and took possession of the palace of the archbishop, from which he was with difficulty expelled by the French. Soon after this,[1] a proclamation was made at Glasgow. It ran in the name of Francis and Mary, king and queen of Scots, and informed those misguided subjects who still respected the authority of the queen-dowager that her whole power had been devolved upon the Lords of the Privy-council who were reformed. Their chief aim, they declared, was to advance the glory of God, and to remove idolatry; for which end they commanded all such clergymen as had not yet made open confession of their faith to appear before the council at St Andrews, and there give full proof of their conversion by a public renunciation of all manner of superstition, under the penalty of losing their benefices and being reputed enemies to God.[2] Nor was this all. In the beginning of the following month, the council of the Congregation at Dundee, in the name of the king and queen, directed their denunciations against the Consistory, which they denominated the court of Antichrist, whose cursings and threatenings, they affirmed, had greatly oppressed and deluded the people. They commanded that no such assembly should afterwards be held, and interdicted such wicked persons as had dared to disobey this injunction from any repetition of their offence, under pain of death.[3] It is certain, therefore, that the Congregation, although Elizabeth did not permit them to name the subject of religion, had in no respect departed from their resolution to destroy the ancient faith, and to plant what they esteemed a purer form of doctrine and worship upon its ruins.

1 30th Nov. 1559.
2 Keith, p. 111.
3 Ibid., p. 112, (14th Dec. 1559.)

The eyes of both parties were now anxiously turned to the sea. The French were aware that the Marquess d'Elbeuf had sailed from Calais with a powerful fleet;[4] the Protestants knew that Winter, the English admiral, was embarked for Scotland, with a squadron of fourteen ships of war. Uncertain, however, of the time they might be detained, it was not judged prudent to risk a defeat;[5] and D'Osell, the French commander, encouraged by some trifling successes, concentrated his force at Dysart, and began his march along the coast, with the design of attacking St Andrews. At this moment some large vessels were descried bearing up the Firth; and the French soldiers, believing them to be their friends, expressed the utmost exultation. In a short time, however, these hopes were turned into dismay. The stranger ships, hoisting the English colours, proved to be Winter, who, having first seized two victuallers which lay in their course, proceeded and cast anchor in the road. Their arrival intimidated D'Osell; but making a forced and circuitous march by Stirling, in which his troops were dreadfully harassed, not only by the snow drifting in their faces, but by the attacks of the Lord James and his cavalry,[6] he at last with difficulty regained his fortifications of Leith. Meanwhile the regent having sent on board the admiral to demand the cause of this visit in a time of peace, was answered, "that his intentions were pacific, and having gone to sea in search of pirates, he had entered the Firth to watch for them there."[7] A remonstrance which she directed to be made to Elizabeth by the French ambassador, De Sevre, was met by a reply equally evasive. The queen solemnly assured him she respected the treaties, and thought of nothing

4 The exact time of the marquess's sailing for Scotland is uncertain. On the 30th Dec. Cecil writes he had not sailed. Sadler, vol. i. p. 669.
5 Sadler, vol. i. p. 690. Ibid., p. 697, (January 23, 1559-60.)
6 Ibid., vol. i. p. 699. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 55.
7 British Museum, MS. Calderwood, vol. i. p. 407. Keith, 116. Sadler, vol. i. p. 697.

less than war; but she added, that she saw with uneasiness the increase of the French force in Scotland, and deemed it prudent to strengthen her Border garrisons, and observe the progress of their arms. De Sevre then replied, "that what chiefly gave discontent to his court was the aid which the Queen of England had given to the Scottish rebels;" to which she answered, "that she could not consider the nobility and nation of Scotland as rebels; she deemed them, on the contrary, wise and faithful subjects to the crown of Scotland, since they had ventured to offend the French king in defence of the rights of his wife, their sovereign." "And truly," added she, "if these barons should permit the government of their kingdom to be wrested out of their hands during the absence of their queen; if they tamely gave up the independence of their native country, whilst she used the counsel, not of the Scots, but solely of the French, her mother and other foreigners being her advisers in Scotland, and the cardinal and Duke of Guise in France, it were a good cause for the world to speak shame of them: nay, if the young queen herself should happen to survive her husband, she would in such a case have just occasion to condemn them all as cowards and unnatural subjects."[1]

Having returned this answer, in which there was some little truth, and a large proportion of duplicity, Elizabeth proceeded to give still more decided encouragement to the Congregation. In the end of January, (1559-60,) the Duke of Norfolk arrived at Berwick, and being afterwards met by Maitland, Balnaves, Pitarrow, and Lord Ruthven, who were sent by the Congregation as commissioners,[2] a treaty was concluded, by which the English queen took under her protection the kingdom of Scotland, with the Duke of Chastelherault and his party. She engaged to send them assistance, and continue her support till the French should be expelled from the country, and not to abandon the confederated lords as long as they recognised Mary for their queen, and maintained inviolate the rights of the crown. On the other hand, it was agreed by the duke and his friends that they would join their forces with the army of England; they promised that no other union of their country with France than that which then existed should ever receive their sanction; they agreed to consider the enemies of England as their own, and if that country should be attacked by France, to furnish the queen with an auxiliary force of four thousand men; they promised, in the last place, that hostages should immediately be given for the performance of these articles, and protested that they would continue loyal to the Queen of Scotland and the king, her husband, in everything which did not tend to the overthrow of the ancient laws and liberties of their country.[3]

This treaty being concluded, and the hostages having arrived at Berwick, the English army, under the command of Lord Grey, entered Scotland on the 2d of April 1560. It consisted of two thousand horse and six thousand foot, and was joined at Preston by the army of the Congregation,[4] led by the duke, the Earls of Argyle, Glencairn, and Menteith, the Lord James, and other principal officers amongst the reformers, and estimated at nearly eight thousand men.

On the advance of the enemy, the queen-regent, alarmed for her personal security, was received by Lord Erskine within the castle of Edinburgh; and the united armies having pushed forward from Preston to Restalrig, a sharp skirmish of cavalry

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 17th February 1559. Backed by Cecil, answer made to the French ambassador, by Sir W. Cecil and Sir ——.

[2] Sadler, vol. i. p. 708. Lethington did not leave London to go to Berwick till February 18. See, also, British Museum, MS. Calderwood, vol. i. p. 411.

[3] Keith, pp. 117-119. Also, British Museum, MS. Calderwood, vol. i. pp. 410, 414, for Instructions to the Scottish Commissioners, and Ratification of the Treaty by the Congregation.

[4] Sadler, vol. i. p. 712. British Museum, MS. Calderwood, vol. i. p. 416.

took place, in which the French were beat back with the loss of forty men and a hundred prisoners.[1] Having determined to besiege Leith, Lord Grey encamped on the fields to the south and south-east of that seaport; Winter, the English admiral, opened a cannonade from the fleet; whilst a battery of eight pieces of ordnance commenced firing on the land side, by which the French guns placed on St Anthony's steeple were speedily silenced and dismounted. But this advantage, which produced in the combined armies an over-confidence and contempt of discipline, was followed by a more serious action, in which Martignes attacked the English trenches, entered the camp, spiked three cannon, and put about six hundred men to the sword, after which he retreated, with little loss, to Leith.[2]

The Congregation were discouraged, not only by this defeat, but by the coldness and continued neutrality of some of the principal barons, who had promised to join their party. Of these, the chief was Huntly, whose power in the northern parts of the realm was almost kingly, whilst his attachment to the Catholic faith, and to his own interest, rendered him difficult to be dealt with. He had at length secretly engaged to make common cause with the reformed party, but he delayed from day to day, watching the progress of events, and calculating the probabilities of success, before he declared himself; and he took the precaution of entering into a separate treaty with the duke and the Lords, by which he stipulated for the preservation of his authority, and the security of his great possessions in the north.[3] The original papers drawn up on this occasion disclose an interesting fact, not formerly stated by any historian. The French, it appears, had gained so much influence in the northern parts of the country, that they procured a league to be made amongst the northern nobles and certain clans and islemen, by which they engaged to defend, with their whole power, the Catholic faith, and to maintain the French authority within the kingdom. Huntly asserted, and probably with some foundation, that as soon as he joined the Congregation he would be attacked as a common enemy by the members of this league; and he was answered by the reformed Lords, that as their agreement bound them to mutual defence, as soon as he joined the party he would participate in this obligation, and enjoy its benefits.[4]

On the 25th of April, Huntly entered the camp, accompanied by sixty horse; and soon after arrived the Bishop of Valence, a commissioner from the court of France, instructed to attempt a mediation between the queen-dowager and the Lords of the Congregation. As Elizabeth had requested he should be heard, the reformers, although indisposed to the negotiation, could not refuse to give him audience; but they insisted that the only basis upon which they could consent to treat should be the demolition of the fortifications of Leith, and the expulsion of the French from Scotland. These terms were rejected by the prelate, who upon his part demanded an express renunciation of the league with England. This, it was said, could not be done without the consent of Elizabeth; but they offered to produce the contract to the estates of Parliament, and if they found the league prejudicial to the liberty of Scotland, or against their allegiance as true subjects, to use every means to have it dissolved.[5] Under such

1 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 6th April 1560. Randolph to Cecil. MS. Calderwood, vol. i. p. 416. Lesley's History, Bannatyne edition, p. 282.

2 15th April, Lesley, p. 285. Keith, p. 124.

3 MS. State-paper Office, My Lord Earl of Huntly's desires and counsel. Backed by Randolph. Also, MS. State-paper Office, The Lords' answer to the Earl of Huntly, 18th April 1560.

4 MS. State-paper Office, My Lord Earl of Huntly's desires and counsel. Backed by Randolph. Also, MS. State-paper Office, The Lords' answer to the Earl of Huntly, 18th April 1560.

5 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 26th April 1560. Also, MS. Letter, Ibid., Randolph to the Duke of Norfolk, 25th April 1560, from the Camp. Also, British Museum, Caligula, book x. folio 88, Memorial

circumstances, the conference having broken off, a second covenant was drawn up by the Congregation,[1] in which they obliged themselves, not only to support the reformation of religion, the freedom of preaching, and the due administration of the sacraments, according to the Word of God, but to resist the tyranny of the French, and to unite for the expulsion of strangers and the recovery of their ancient liberty.[2]

After many delays, Huntly at last consented to sign this agreement; and a reinforcement having arrived from England, Lord Grey determined to concentrate his whole efforts upon the siege of Leith, which began to suffer dreadfully from famine. Early in May a general assault was made, but treachery had entered the English camp. Sir James Crofts, to whom the attack upon the quarter towards the sea had been committed, failed to bring forward his division in time; the scaling ladders on being applied to the wall were found too short, and the English, after their utmost efforts, were driven back with severe loss.[3] The queen-regent, availing herself of this success, expressed her deep commiseration for the afflicted state of the country, and requested an interview with the Earls of Huntly and Glencairn, with whom she was ready to enter into a negotiation. Instead, however, of these two noblemen, the Lord James, with Lethington, Lord Ruthven, and the Master of Maxwell, waited upon her; they offered to dismiss their troops, to return to their allegiance, and acknowledge her authority, under the single condition that the French soldiers should depart the realm; and if these terms were accepted, they were ready, they said, to refer all other subjects in dispute to the decision of a parliament. There seems every reason to believe that the regent, if permitted to follow her own opinion, would have closed with these proposals; but her hands were tied by her French advisers. She requested time to consult La Brosse, D'Osell, and the Bishop of Amiens; this was refused—apparently unreasonably refused—and the conference came abruptly to an end.[4]

The anxiety of the queen-dowager for peace was dictated by her own precarious health. Her constitution, worn out by fatigue and anxiety, was now completely broken. Since her retreat within the castle of Edinburgh, she had been repeatedly attacked by severe fits of sickness, and feeling that her period of life would be brief, she laboured to compose the troubles of the kingdom. This charitable design it was not permitted her to accomplish; but finding herself reduced to such a state of weakness, that death was rapidly approaching, she requested an interview with the leaders of the Congregation.[5] The Duke of Chastelherault, the Earls of Argyle, Marshal, and Glencairn, with the Lord James, immediately repaired to the castle, and, entering her bedchamber, were welcomed by the dying queen with a kindness and cordiality which deeply moved them. She expressed her grief for the distracted state of the nation, and advised them to send both the French and English forces out of the kingdom; she declared her unfeigned concern that matters had been pushed to such extremities; ascribed it to the perverse counsels of the French cabinet, which she found herself obliged to obey, and denounced the crafty and interested advice of Huntly, who had interrupted the conference at Preston, when she was herself ready to have agreed to their proposals. She recommended to them a faithful adherence to their league with France, which was in no degree inconsistent with, but rather necessarily arose out of the obedience they owed to their lawful sovereign and the maintenance of their national liberty. To these advices she added many endearing ex-

to the Queen-dowager, by Chaperon, 11th April 1560.

[1] 27th April.

[2] Keith, p. 125.

[3] Ibid., p. 124. See Mr Stevenson's Illustrations of the reign of Mary, p. 80. Letter of the Dowager to D'Osell.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 14th May 1560, Lethington to Cecil.

[5] Ibid., 8th June 1560, Randolph to Cecil.

pressions, and with tears asked pardon of all whom she had in any way offended, declaring that she herself freely forgave the injuries she might have received, and trusted that they should all meet with the same forgiveness at the bar of God. She then, with an expression full of sweetness, though her countenance was pallid and emaciated, embraced and kissed the nobles one by one, extending her hand to those of inferior rank who stood by, as a token of dying charity. It was impossible that so much love, so gently and unaffectedly expressed, should fail to move those to whom it was addressed. The hardy barons, who had lately opposed her with the bitterest rancour, were dissolved in tears; they earnestly requested her to send for some godly and learned man, from whom she might receive, not only consolation, but instruction; and on the succeeding day she willingly admitted a visit from Willock.[1] Mild in his manner, but faithful to his belief, the minister spoke to the dying princess of the efficacy of the death of Christ, and the abomination of the mass as a relic of idolatry. To the first point, she assured him that she looked for salvation in no other way than in and through the death of her Saviour; to the second, she quietly declined to give an answer, and on the succeeding day expired, full of faith and hope.[2]

Had she been permitted to follow her own excellent understanding, there seems little doubt that the queen-regent would have succeeded in composing the differences which so grievously distracted the kingdom, and threw so deep a gloom over the concluding years of her government. Possessed, according to the testimony of writers whose opposite principles render their evidence unsuspected, of a sound and clear intellect, a kind heart, and a generous and forgiving temper, she had gained the affections of the people, and the confidence of the nobility, by the wisdom, liberality, and prudence with which she conducted the affairs of the country during the first years of her regency. These were eminently popular and successful, nor did the tide turn against her, till, surrounded by the perils and difficulties of the Reformation, she was compelled to adopt the violent principles of the house of Guise, and to forsake the system of conciliation which she at first adopted. It is sad to find that intolerance and persecution pursued her even after death. "Question," says Calderwood, "being moved afterwards about her burial, the preachers boldly gainstood to the use of any superstitious rites in that realm which God of his mercy had begun to purge. Her burial was deferred till further advisement; her corpse was lapped in a coffin of lead, and kept in the castle from the 10th of June till the 19th of October, at which time it was carried by some pioneers to a ship,"[3] and transported to France.

[1] Keith, p. 128. Also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 8th June 1560. Randolph to Cecil.

[2] Ibid. She died on the 10th of June 1560.

[3] British Museum, MS. Calderwood, vol. i. p. 421.

CHAPTER V.

MARY.

1560—1561.

PREVIOUS to the death of the queen-regent all parties had become averse to the continuance of the war. From the first Elizabeth had expressed to her ministers her earnest wish to remain at peace, if it could be accomplished with security and honour; and although she at length consented to send an army into Scotland, during its march, and even after the opening of hostilities, her negotiations for an amicable settlement with France were earnest and uninterrupted: nor were the ministers of that kingdom less anxious to bring matters to an adjustment. They were convinced that the sagacity and penetration of Cecil and Throckmorton had fully detected their ambitious designs upon England; they agreed that the vast and impracticable project of the house of Guise for the destruction of the reformed religion, and the union of the kingdoms of England, Scotland, and France under one head, must be for the present abandoned. The extraordinary expense of the Scottish war could no longer be borne; and in the present state of France, itself torn by religious persecution, and weakened by frequent conspiracies and popular commotions, peace appeared the only remedy for the country. Nor were the Lords of the Congregation prepared to prolong the struggle: experience had shewn them that, even with the assistance of England, France was a more formidable enemy than they had imagined. The fortifications of Leith were so strong, that Lethington acknowledged in one of his letters it might defy, if well victualled, an army of twenty thousand men.[1]

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Norfolk, 9th April 1560.

It was impossible for them to keep the great body of their forces, composed of the feudal militia, for any long time under arms; and without money, which was exceedingly scarce amongst them, their hired soldiers were ready to mutiny and sell themselves to the enemy. They were as willing, therefore, to negotiate as the other belligerents; and under these circumstances, after some time spent in correspondence and preliminary arrangements, Cecil, the able minister of Elizabeth, and Sir Nicholas Wotton, repaired to Edinburgh in the middle of June. Here they met the French commissioners, the Bishops of Valence and Amiens, La Brosse, D'Osell, and the Sieur de Randan, who being the bearer of a letter from his master the French king to Elizabeth, had in his passage through England been admitted to an interview with that princess.[2]

The treaty which was now about to be concluded embraced two great objects. It was necessary to settle, first, the differences between France and England; and, secondly, to secure the interests of the Lords of the Congregation. They had taken up arms against their natural sovereign for the expulsion of the French troops from their country, and to restore, as they alleged, the kingdom to its ancient liberty. With this end in view, they had entered into a separate treaty with Elizabeth, who had afforded them assistance both in money and by the presence of an army. It was necessary, therefore, to protect them from

[2] Forbes, vol. i. p. 432. State-paper Office, MS. Letter, Cecil to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 19th June 1560.

the probable vengeance of their own sovereign; and this could only be done by including, in the agreement between England and France, a recognition of the treaty between Elizabeth and the reformed Lords. The complaint that the arms and title of the monarchs of England had been unjustly assumed by the King and Queen of France was easily adjusted. The French commissioners, with little difficulty, agreed to renounce it, and even to consider the claim of compensation made by Elizabeth for the injury which she had sustained. But serious debates arose upon the second point. The negotiations here included that large portion of the nobles and commons of Scotland which had embraced the Reformation. They had taken arms in the beginning of the war to protect themselves from persecution, and to secure liberty of conscience: as it proceeded they had boldly announced their determination to overthrow the established religion; they had carried this resolution into effect by an attack upon the religious houses, whose revenues had been seized; they had placed their lands in the hands of agents or factors, and the ecclesiastical proprietors had been reduced to poverty. Nor was this all: this same party had suspended the queen-regent from the exercise of her authority, and had assumed the supreme power, not only without any commission from their sovereign, but contrary to her express injunctions. It was not without reason, therefore, that they were regarded in France as guilty of rebellion; and with justice it was pleaded by the French commissioners that the treaty of Berwick, between the Queen of England and the Lords of the Congregation, could never be recognised as binding by their sovereign, without compromising her dignity in the most serious manner.

But if the French lords were thus anxious to dissolve this obnoxious league, Cecil, who saw its advantages, was as resolute that it should be maintained. He declared it to be the fixed intention of his mistress that the treaty of Berwick should be not only recognised but confirmed. The commissioners of Mary and Francis remonstrated. "They had received no authority," they said, "on this point; it was even part of their instructions that any allusion to it should be carefully avoided." The superior diplomatic craft of Cecil was successfully exerted to meet the difficulty. He affected to be indignant and inflexible. "All conference," he said, "must be broken off. The Duke of Norfolk should receive orders to advance with his army into Scotland, and the matter must once more be committed to the arbitrement of the sword." Nay, so vigorously did he exert himself, that, on some question raised by the French regarding Elizabeth's right to the kingdoms of England and Ireland, the minister threw his defiance in the teeth of the French commissioners, and offered in that quarrel to spend his blood upon any of them that would deny it.[1] How this bravado was received does not appear; but in the end the dexterity of Cecil was triumphant. By his directions, an article was framed which flattered the vanity of the French, and preserved the dignity of their sovereign, whilst it secured the real interests of the Congregation without including any formal declaration that the concessions made to them by France proceeded from the alliance they had made with England. The sentence of the letter in which the minister communicates this result to his royal mistress is characteristic. "To make a cover for all this, those ambassadors were forced by us to take a few good words in a preface to the same article, and we, content with the kernel, yielded to them the shell to play withal."[2]

The treaty now concluded was in every way advantageous to the English queen. The claims of France, and the pretensions of this power, had been a source of great annoyance to her from the commencement of her reign; they were now finally renounced. It was

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Cecil and Wotton to Elizabeth, 2d July 1560.

[2] Hayne's State Papers, vol. i. pp. 352, 353.

agreed that the French army should leave Scotland; all anxiety regarding an attack upon her kingdom through this country was removed; and her influence over the Lords of the Congregation was confirmed by the gratitude they felt for the assistance she had given them, as well as by the anxiety she had manifested in the negotiations to protect their interests and interpose her power between them and their offended sovereign. In a letter to his mistress, Cecil justly observes, "that the treaty would be no small augmentation to her honour in this beginning of her reign, that it would finally procure that conquest of Scotland which none of her progenitors with all their battles ever obtained—namely, the whole hearts and good-wills of the nobility and people, which surely was better for England than the revenue of the crown."[1]

That portion of the treaty which embraced the affairs of the Congregation is particularly worthy of notice, as it led to the full establishment of the Reformation, and is intimately connected with the subsequent course of events. It provided that an act of oblivion should be passed for all wrongs or injuries committed, from the 6th of March 1558 to the 1st of August 1560; and that a general peace and reconciliation of all differences should take place amongst the nobility and subjects of the land, including the members of the Congregation and those who still adhered to the ancient faith. The Duke of Chastelherault, and other Scottish nobles or barons, who possessed lands in France were to be restored to their possessions; redress was to be given by parliament to the bishops and other churchmen who had received injury, and no man was to molest them in the collection of their revenues. For the better government of the realm, a council of twelve was to be constituted, of which the queen was to appoint seven and the estates five. It was to be their duty to take cognizance of everything during the absence of their sovereign the Queen of France. No fewer than six were to assemble on any occasion; and the whole, or at least a majority, were to meet upon all matters of moment. Peace and war were never to be declared without the concurrence of the estates. It was anxiously provided, that in all time coming the realm should be governed by its native subjects; no foreign troops were to be brought within the kingdom; no strangers to administer justice; none but Scotsmen to be placed in the high offices of chancellor, treasurer, or comptroller; and all ecclesiastics, although Scotsmen, were excluded from these two last dignities. The nobility were interdicted from assembling soldiers or making any warlike convocations, except in such cases as were sanctioned by established usage; and it was determined that the army of England should return home immediately after the embarkation of the French troops.[2] It was lastly agreed that a parliament should be held in the succeeding month of August, for which a commission was to be sent by the King and Queen of France; and it was added that this meeting of the estates should in all respects be as lawful as if the same had been convoked by command of those royal persons, provided only that all who ought to be present resorted without fear to the parliament, and that its proceedings were free and unfettered.[3]

The conclusion of this treaty by the French commissioners, La Rochefoucault, lord of Randan, and the Bishop of Valence, was a great triumph to Elizabeth and the Congregation. The French cabinet had instructed their commissioners to beware of alluding, in the most distant manner, to the

[1] Original Draft, State-paper Office, Cecil and Wotton to the Queen, 8th July 1560. Also, British Museum, Titus, book ii. fol. 451. MS. Letter, Lord Clinton to the Earl of Sussex—"This peace is greatly to the Queen's honour and of these realms."

[2] Spottiswood, p. 147. Maitland, vol. ii. p. 926. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 26th June 1560, Cecil to ——. Also, British Museum, MS. Calderwood, vol. i. pp. 422, 427.

[3] Forbes, vol. i. p. 432, State-paper Office, MS. Letter, Cecil to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 19th June 1560.

treaty of Berwick, which had been entered into between the reformers and England; and if they could not procure the consent of the queen to the dissolution of this league, to be on their guard, at least, that no clause should be introduced which should have the effect of including the leaders of the Protestants within the protection of the treaty. Baffled, however, in their diplomacy by the superior tactics of Cecil, (whose cold, equable temper seems to have been seized with a fit of unusual exultation in alluding to the result,) Randan and Monluc, contrary to their instructions, agreed to the insertion of a sentence which virtually protected the reformers, and preserved their treaty with Elizabeth. Nay, so wary had been the conduct of Wotton and Cecil, that, to use their own words, "even if the said treaty shall not remain in force, the special points tending to keep Frenchmen out of Scotland be well and assuredly provided for."[1] The reformed Lords were not tardy to acknowledge the great obligations conferred upon them by the issue to which Elizabeth had brought the negotiations. They addressed a letter to the queen, containing the warmest expressions of gratitude, and acknowledged that, in providing for the security and liberty of Scotland, the realm was more bounden to her majesty than to their own sovereign.[2] Nor was this excess of gratitude at all unnatural. By the various provisions above detailed, it is evident that the Protestants had amply secured their own interests. One only objection existed to this part of the treaty, but it was a fatal one; the commissioners of Mary and Francis had no authority from their sovereign to enter into any negotiation with the Congregation, and the Queen of Scotland refused to be bound by an agreement to which she was no party.

It is remarkable that the treaty included no express provision on the subject of the reformed religion, whilst the bishops and ministers of the ancient faith were treated with uncommon lenity; their property restored, their persons protected, their right of sitting in parliament acknowledged. The cause of all this is not difficult to discover: the assistance given by Elizabeth had no reference to religion; she had agreed to support the Protestants with her army, on the sole ground that they had taken arms to preserve the liberty of their country, and to expel the French, who, through Scotland, threatened her own dominions, and questioned her title to the throne. Individually, the queen was not disposed to favour the religious views of the Congregation, whose ultra-Protestantism she regarded with aversion. Cecil, therefore, was instructed not to meddle with the subject; and the point was left open, to be afterwards settled between the reformers and their own sovereign. Yet, in gaining the power to assemble a parliament, for which their queen was to send over a commission, and whose proceedings were to be esteemed as valid as if called by her own writ, they obtained their utmost wishes. The great body of the people, the cities, burghs, and middle classes, were, they knew, favourable to the Reformation; and they reckoned with confidence on a majority amongst the nobles, many of whom had already tasted the sweets of ecclesiastical plunder, and were little disposed to give up what they had won. For these reasons, although certain articles concerning religion were presented to the commissioners on the part of the nobles and people of Scotland, their refusal to enter into discussion upon them does not appear to have occasioned either fear or disappointment. They looked to the convention of estates, which was so soon to meet, and felt confident that all would be there settled to their satisfaction.[3]

The treaty having been concluded and signed by the commissioners, peace was proclaimed at Edinburgh on the 8th July 1560. Soon after, the French army, consisting of four thousand men, were embarked in English ships for

[1] Haynes, vol. i. p. 352.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 17th July 1560. Haynes, vol. i. pp. 349, 351.

[3] Keith, p. 142, article 17.

France; the English forces at the same time began their march homeward; and on reaching Eyemouth demolished the fortifications according to the agreement.[1] A solemn public thanksgiving was held by the reformed nobles and the greatest part of the Congregation in St Giles's church, where the preacher, who was probably Knox, in a prayer preserved in his history, described the miseries of their country, lately groaning under the oppression of a foreign yoke and a worship which he pronounced abominable and idolatrous. He acknowledged the mercy of God in sending, through the instrumentality of England, a deliverance which their own policy or strength could never have accomplished; called upon them all to maintain that godly league entered into with Elizabeth, and implored God to confound the counsels of those who endeavoured to dissolve it.[2] Ministers were then appointed to some of the chief towns in the kingdom, Knox being directed to continue his charge at Edinburgh, whilst Goodman was sent to St Andrews, Heriot to Aberdeen, Row to Perth, and others to Jedburgh, Dundee, Dunfermline, and Leith. Superintendents were next chosen for the districts of Lothian, Glasgow, Fife, Angus and Mearns, and lastly for Argyle and the Isles.[3]

On the 10th of July the parliament assembled, to adjourn, as had been determined, to the 1st of August, on which day the proceedings were opened with great solemnity. So grave and important a meeting of this great council of the nation had not taken place for many years; and the attendance of all ranks was, we know from Lethington, more numerous than had ever been seen in his time.[4] One cause of this crowded attendance was a proceeding adopted by the lesser barons. Many of these persons, notwithstanding their right to sit and vote in the assembly of the three estates, had ceased to claim their privilege. Indifference to public affairs, occupation upon their own demesnes, and the expense of a journey to the capital, had occasioned their absence. But it was amongst these persons that the reformed doctrines had made the greatest progress; and, aware that the subjects to be debated must involve the great religious principles in dispute between the Congregation and the Catholics, they attended in their places and presented a petition, in which they prayed to be restored to their privilege, and to be allowed to give their counsel and vote in parliament. After some trifling opposition, they were permitted to take their seats, although a final decision on their claims does not appear to have been given. The accession, however, of so many votes, (their number being a hundred,) was of no small consequence to the Protestants, who were anxious that they should immediately proceed to the business of the parliament. On this, however, there arose a serious difference of opinion. It was pleaded by many that no parliament could be held till the commission arrived from their sovereign, or, at least, till some reply was received to the message which had been sent to France, informing her of their proceedings.[5] Others alleged that, by one of the articles of the peace, it had been determined that a meeting of the three estates should be held in August, which should be as lawful as if it were summoned by express command of their queen; and the question having been put to the vote, it was decided that the parliament should continue its sittings.[6] A week, however, was spent in the

[1] Rymer, Fœdera, vol. xv. pp. 493, 601.
[2] Knox, pp. 251, 252. British Museum, MS. Calderwood, vol. i. p. 428.
[3] Keith, p. 145.
[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 15th Aug. 1560.
[5] It does not appear who were despatched on this mission to inform their sovereign. As late as the 9th of August 1560, the French king expressed to Throckmorton, the English ambassador, his surprise that he had heard nothing from his commissioners, and affirmed that he had not yet seen the treaty of Edinburgh. The Bishop of Glasgow and the Lord Seton had arrived at Paris on the 3d of August. — MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Sir N. Throckmorton, 9th August 1560.
[6] Spottiswood, p. 149.

debate. Many, on learning the result, departed from the capital, and of the spiritual estate very few attended.

These preliminary questions having been settled, the crown, the mace, and the sword were laid upon the seat or throne usually occupied by the queen;[1] and Maitland, who possessed great influence with the Congregation, being chosen speaker, (the term then used was "harangue-maker,") opened the proceedings in an oration, of which Randolph has given us the principal heads. He excused his insufficiency to occupy that place; made a brief discourse of things past; shewed what necessity men were forced into for defence of their country; what remedy and support it had pleased God to send them; and how much they were bound heartily to acknowledge and requite it. He took away the persuasion which had then entered into many men's minds, that other things were intended than those which had been attempted; he advised all estates to renounce their individual feelings, and to bend themselves wholly to the true service of God and their country, describing the miserable condition to which it had been long reduced for lack of good government and exercise of justice. He exhorted them to mutual amity and hearty friendship—one to live with another as members all of one body, using the example of the fable, "when the mouth, having quarrelled with the members, refused to receive sustenance for so long a time that the whole body perished." In conclusion, he prayed God long to maintain amity and peace with all princes, and especially betwixt the realms of England and Scotland, in the love and fear of God.[2] The Clerk-register now rose, and having inquired of the three estates to what matter they would proceed, it was judged proper that the articles of the peace should be read over, which having been done, they received the unanimous approbation of the assembly, and were directed to be sent over to France for the ratification of their sovereign. The Lords of the Articles were next chosen, the order of which, says Randolph, "is, that the Lords Spiritual choose the Temporal, and the Temporal the Spiritual—the Burgesses their own."[3] Great complaint was here made by the prelates, that in the selection of the Lords Spiritual none were chosen but such as were known to be well affected to the new religion, nor was it unnoticed that some upon whom the choice had fallen were mere laymen. So great was the majority, however, of the friends of the Congregation, that it was impossible to have redress. "This being done," says Randolph, in an interesting letter to Cecil, where he describes the proceedings of the parliament, "the Lords departed, and accompanied the Duke of Chastelherault as far as the Bow, which is the gate going out of the High Street, and many down unto the palace where he lieth; the town all in armour, the trumpets sounding, and all other kinds of music, such as they have. Other solemnities have not been used, saving in times long past the Lords have had parliament robes, which are now with them wholly out of use; the Lords of the Articles sat from henceforth in Holyrood House, except that at such times as, upon any matter of importance, the whole Lords assembled themselves again, as they did this day, in the Parliament House."[4]

Having proceeded thus far, a petition was presented to the parliament by some of the most zealous of the reformers. It prayed that the doctrines professed by the Roman Catholic Church, and tyrannically maintained by the clergy, should be condemned and abolished; and amongst the errors it particularly enumerated transubstantiation, the adoration of Christ's body under the form of bread, the merit of good works, purgatory, pilgrimages, and prayers to departed saints. It declared that God of His great mercy, by the light of His Word,

[1] Keith, p. 149, erroneously states that the royal ensigns of the kingdom were omitted to be carried into the parliament.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office. Randolph to Cecil, 9th and 10th Aug. 1560.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office. Randolph to Cecil, 9th and 10th Aug. 1560.

[4] Ibid.

had demonstrated to no small number within the realm the pestiferous errors of the Romish Church—errors which the ministers of that Church had maintained by fire and sword, and which brought damnation upon the souls that embraced them. It stated in strong and coarse language that the sacraments of our Lord were shamefully abused by that Roman harlot by whom the true discipline of the Church was extinguished; and proceeded to give an appalling picture of the corrupt lives of those who called themselves the clergy. Embracing the whole Papal Church in one sweeping anathema, the petitioners offered to prove that "in all the rabble of the clergy" there was not one lawful minister, if the Word of God and the practices of the apostles and primitive Church were to be taken as authority upon this point; it denominated them thieves and murderers, rebels, traitors, and adulterers; living in all manner of abominations, and unworthy to be suffered in any reformed commonwealth. Lastly, using that blessed name which ought to be the bond of love and charity as an incitement to railing and persecution, it called upon the parliament, in the bowels of Jesus Christ, to employ the victory which they had obtained with wholesome vigour; to compel the body of the Romish clergy to answer these accusations now brought against them; to pronounce them unworthy of authority in the Church of God, and expel them for ever from having a voice or vote in the great council of the nation; which, it continued, if ye do not, we forewarn you, in the fear of God, and by assurance of His Word, that as ye leave a grievous yoke and a burden intolerable upon the Church of God within this realm, so shall they be thorns in your eyes, and pricks in your sides, whom afterwards, when ye would, ye shall have no power to remove. In conclusion, it virtually declared that this extraordinary petition was not theirs but God's, who craved this by His servants; and it prayed Him to give them an upright heart and a right understanding of the request made through them.[1]

The names of those who signed this violent production, which it is difficult to read without emotions of sorrow and pity, do not appear. Knox, whose fiery zeal flamed high at this period, seized the sitting of the parliament as a proper season for a course of sermons on the prophecies of Haggai, in which he tells us he was peculiarly "special and vehement," the doctrine being proper to the times.[2] Many of the nobles, however, who had prospered upon the plunder of the Church demurred to the sentiments of the preacher, when he exhorted them to restore their lands for the support of the ministers; and Lethington exclaimed in mockery, "We must now forget ourselves, and bear the barrow to build the house of God."[3] Yet, although some were thus foolish, others of the barons and burgesses assembled, and we are informed by Knox that the petition emanated from them. There can be no doubt that it received the sanction, if it was not the composition of the reformer.

On being read in parliament this petition occasioned a great diversity of sentiment: to the sincere Catholic it justly appeared an impious denouncement of all that he esteemed sacred, and even the more moderate of those who had embraced the tenets of the Reformation might well doubt whether it was not calculated to inflame rather than to heal the wounds it proposed to cure; still there can be little doubt that, as the majority in the parliament supported the changes proposed, it would have been favourably received but for one circumstance, which touched some of the highest and most influential of the Protestant leaders. It called upon them to restore the patrimony of the Church, of which they had unjustly possessed themselves, to the uses for which it was originally destined—the support

[1] British Museum, MS. Calderwood, vol. i. p. 430. Knox, p. 252.
[2] Knox, p. 254.
[3] Ibid. The name is not given in the printed Knox.

of the ministers, the restoration of godly learning, and the assistance of the poor. This, according to Knox, was unpalatable doctrine to the nobles, who for worldly respects abhorred a perfect reformation.[1] Waving, therefore, the practical part of the question, and retaining for the present the wealth they had won, the majority of the parliament commanded the ministers to draw up a confession of their faith, or a brief summary of those doctrines which they conceived wholesome, true, and necessary to be believed,[2] and received within the realm. This solemn and arduous task was achieved apparently with extraordinary rapidity; but although only four days were employed in its preparation, it is evident that the Confession of Faith embodied the results of much previous study and consultation. It is a clear summary of Christian doctrine, grounded on the Word of God. On most essential points it approximates indefinitely near, and in many instances uses the very words of the Apostles' Creed, and the Articles of the Church of England as established by Edward the Sixth. Thus, in the section on baptism, the Scottish Confession of Faith declares, "We assuredly believe that by baptism *we are ingrafted into Jesus Christ*, to be made partakers of His *justice*, by the which our sins are covered and remitted." Compare this with the article of Edward the Sixth and of Elizabeth "Of Baptism." It is there said to be a sign, not only of profession, but of regeneration, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly "*are grafted into the Church*." Again, of the Lord's Supper the Scottish Confession of Faith declares, "We most assuredly believe that the bread that we break is the communion of Christ's body, and the cup which we bless is the communion of His blood; so that we do confess and believe that the faithful in the right use of the Lord's table so do eat the body and drink the blood of the Lord Jesus that He remaineth in them and they in Him." In the Articles of Edward the Sixth the same precise words are used. Indeed, it is worthy of remark, that in these holy mysteries of our faith this Confession, drawn up by the primitive Scottish reformers, keeps in some points at a greater distance from the rationalising of ultra-Protestantism than the Articles of Edward. But to return, before the authors of the Confession agreed finally on every point it should embrace, the treatise was submitted to the revisal of the Secretary Lethington and the sub-Prior of St Andrews, who mitigated the austerity of many words and sentences, and expunged a chapter on the limits of the obedience due by subjects to their magistrates, which they considered improper to be then discussed. So at least, says Randolph, but it is certain that a chapter "Of the Civil Magistrate" forms a portion of the Confession of Faith as it is printed by Knox,[3] and that it not only prescribes in strong terms the obedience due by subjects to princes, governors, and magistrates, as powers ordained by God, but pronounces all who attempt to abolish the "Holy State of Civil Policies" as enemies alike to God and man.

When thus finished, this important paper was laid before parliament; but all disputation upon its doctrines appears to have been waved by a mutual understanding that on the one side it was unnecessary, and on the other it would be unavailing. The Roman Catholics knew that against them was arrayed a violent and overwhelming majority. So keen were the feelings of some of their leaders, that the Duke of Chastelherault had threatened his brother, the Archbishop of St Andrews, with death, if he dared to exert himself against it;[4] nor is it by any means improbable that similar arguments had been used with other dignitaries. Of the temporal peers present, the Earls of Cassillis and Caithness alone dissented; of the spiritual, the primate, with the Bishops

[1] Knox, p. 252.
[2] Spottiswood, p. 150.
[3] Knox's Hist., p. 270. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 7th September 1560, Randolph to Cecil.
[4] Keith, pp. 150, 487.

of Dunkeld and Dunblane. Time, they said, had not been given them to examine the book: they were ready to give their consent to all things which were sanctioned by the Word of God, and to abolish the abuses which had crept into the Church, but they requested some delay, that the debate upon a question which branched into so many intricate, profound, and important subjects might be carried on with due study and deliberation.[1] To these sensible and moderate representations no attention appears to have been paid; the treatise was laid upon the table, the bishops were called upon to oppugn it upon the instant, and having declined the contest, the consent of the parliament was given almost by acclamation; some of the Lords, in the enthusiasm of the moment, declared they would sooner end their lives than think contrary to these doctrines; many offered to shed their blood in the cause. The Earl Marshal, with indignant sarcasm, called upon the bishops, as the pillars of the papal Church, to defend the tenets of their master; and the venerable Lord Lindsay, rising up in his place, and alluding to his extreme age, declared that since God had spared him to see that day, and the accomplishment of so worthy a work, he was ready with Simeon to say, "Nunc dimittis."[2]

This Confession having been sanctioned by parliament, as the standard of the Protestant faith in Scotland, it was thought proper to complete the work by passing three acts. The first abolished for ever in that country the power and jurisdiction of the pope; the second repealed all former statutes passed in favour of the Roman Catholic Church; the third ordained that all who said mass, or who dared to hear mass, should, for the first transgression, be punished with confiscation of goods; for the second, incur the penalty of banishment from the kingdom; and if guilty of a third offence, be put to death. Few blessings have been of slower growth in Europe than religious toleration. The same men who had groaned so lately under persecution, who upbraided their brethren, and with perfect justice, for the tyranny of maintaining their errors by fire and sword, now injured the cause they advocated by similar severities, and compelled the reception of what they pronounced the truth, under the penalty of death.

In these transactions, Randolph, who was now resident in Edinburgh, in the character of Elizabeth's envoy at the Scottish court, took a prominent part. The spirit in which he carried on his intrigues will be understood from a passage in one of his letters relating to a subject about to be brought before the parliament—the signing the contract made between Elizabeth and the Congregation at Berwick. "The Bishop of Dunblane," says he, "is also now come; it is not to reason upon religion, but to do, as I hear, whatsoever the Earl of Argyle will command him. If God have prepared him and his metropolitan to die obstinate Papists, yet I would wish that before they go to the devil they would shew some token that once in their lives they loved their country, and set their hands to the contract, as hardly I believe they will."[3] These uncharitable and intolerant feelings, however, were not cherished against the Roman prelates alone. It was the opinion of many of the leaders of the Reformation now in progress in Scotland that the hierarchy of England, as established under Elizabeth, was nearly as corrupt as Rome itself. In a letter addressed by Goodman, originally a minister of the English Church, but now one of the most active preachers of the Congregation, to Cecil, he exhorted that powerful statesman to "abolish all the relics of

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 18th August 1560, Lethington to Cecil. In the letter of Randolph to Cecil, quoted below, (Note 2,) he says, "Of the Temporal Lords, the Earl of Cassillis, and the Earl of Caithness, said, 'Nae;' the rest of the Lords with common consent allowed the same." Yet Knox and Spottiswood mention Athole, Borthwick, and Somerville as dissentient.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 19th August 1560.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to ——, (Cecil, I think,) but the name does not appear. 15th August, 1560.

superstition and idolatry which, to the grief and scandal of the godly, were still retained in England, and (alluding probably to Bonner and Gardiner) not to suffer the bloody bishops and known murderers of God's people and your dear brethren to live, upon whom God hath expressly pronounced the sentence of death, for the execution of which He hath committed the sword into your hands, who are now placed in authority." It was this delay, he declared, this leniency in Cecil, (who was happily not animated by the same fiery spirit of persecution which guided the proceedings of Goodman,) that sticketh most in the hearts of many.[1]

The Confession of Faith having been passed in parliament, the clergy next proceeded to compose a Book of Discipline, for the future government of the Church. Into the contents of this celebrated form of Church polity it is, of course, impossible to enter at any length; but it is important to remark, that it committed the election of ministers to the people, using the precaution that the person so chosen, before he was admitted to the holy office, should be examined by the ministers and elders openly upon all points then in controversy between the Church of Rome and the Congregation, and generally upon the whole extent of sound Christian doctrine. Such having been done, the person elected and approved of was to be considered an ordained minister, and to be publicly introduced by his brethren to his congregation in the church to which he was appointed, it being expressly declared, "that any other ceremonies than the approbation of the people, and the declaration of the chief minister that the person presented is appointed to serve," are not approved of by the Congregation; "for albeit," they add, "the apostles used the imposition of hands, yet, seeing the miracle is ceased, the using the ceremony we judge not to be necessary." The same form appointed "readers" to such churches as, owing to the rarity of learned and godly men, could not immediately be provided with ministers. It was their office simply to read the Common Prayers and the Scriptures, not to administer the sacraments. Lastly, the country was divided into ten dioceses, and over them were appointed ten ministers, who were named superintendents. These were not to be "suffered to live idle, as the bishops had done heretofore," neither were they to be stationary, but to be ambulatory preachers, continuing about three or four months in one place, after which they were to enter into a visitation of their whole bounds, preaching thrice a-week at the least, and not intermitting their labours until the churches were wholly planted. They were directed to inquire into the life and behaviour of the ministers, the manners of the people, the provision for the poor, and the instruction of the youth; and under this last head may be noticed, as first appearing in this Book of Discipline, that wise and admirable institution of parish schools, to which Scotland has owed so much of her prosperity. "It was necessary," such are nearly the words of the Congregation, "that care should be had of the virtuous and godly education of the youth, wherefore it was judged in every parish to have a proper schoolmaster, able to teach at least the Grammar and Latin tongue, where the town was of any reputation." But it adds, "in landward, (that is country parishes,) where the people convened to doctrine only once in the week, there must either the reader or the minister take care of the youth of the parish, to instruct them in their rudiments, and especially in the Catechism of Geneva."[2]

This Book of Discipline was almost as bitterly opposed as the Confession had been warmly and unanimously supported. Some of the nobles and barons positively refused to subscribe it; others signed it, but eluded its injunctions; others, who dreaded the punishment of their vices or the curtailing of their revenues, mocked at its provisions and pronounced them devout imaginations. "The cause," says

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Goodman to Cecil, 26th October, 1559.

[2] Spottiswood, p. 154-160, inclusive.

Knox, "we have before declared. Some were licentious, some had greedily gripped[1] the possessions of the Church, and others thought that they would not lack their part of Christ's coat. . . The chief great man," he continues, "that professed Christ and refused to subscribe the Book of Discipline was the Lord Erskine. And no wonder; for besides that he had a very evil woman to his wife, if the poor, the schools, and the ministry of the Church had their own, his kitchen would lack two parts and more of that which he now unjustly possesseth. Assuredly some of us have wondered how men that profess godliness could of so long continuance hear the threatenings of God against thieves and against their houses, and knowing themselves guilty in such things as were openly rebuked, that they never had remorse of conscience, neither yet intended to restore anything of that which long they had stolen and reft. There were none within the realm more unmerciful to the poor ministers than those which had the greatest rents of the churches."[2]

But if severe to the Presbyterian clergy, the parliament was still more decisive against the Catholic prelates. Of these, many who had considered the meeting illegal absented themselves; others took their seats, and having protested against the injustice of excluding them from being chosen Lords of the Articles, declined all interference with the proceedings. A bill of complaint was then presented by the barons against them, "containing," says Randolph, "rather a general accusation of all living bishops than any special crime that they were burdened with: this apparently no answer to mass, or [illegible]: the Bishops of Dunblane should, for [illegible]ws, and Dunkeld were [illegible]alled upon to pursue the [illegible]; and, as they neglected to appear, a decree was passed for the "stay of their livings."[3]

But this was not all. The Catholic prelates, in their anxiety to preserve their estates from the grasp of the barons of the Congregation, had adopted the expedient of granting conveyances, or leases of their lands, to those who agreed to pay them the rents, and to reconvey them to their original proprietors in more prosperous times. Against these alleged alienations of the estates of the Church, which had been sanctioned by the Pope, the parliament directed its censure, ordaining that all such leases should be void without further process of law.[4]

One of the last subjects which occupied the attention of the parliament was the selection of the twenty-four members, out of which number the Council of Twelve was to be chosen. It was scarcely to be expected that the choice should be impartial. Yet, although care was taken to include all the principal leaders of the Congregation, it embraced some of the opposite party. It consisted of the Duke, the Earl of Arran, the Earls of Huntly, Argyle, Glencairn, Morton, Athole, Menteith, Marshal, and Rothes; the Lords James, Erskine, Ruthven, Lindsay, Boyd, Ogilvy, St John, and the Master of Maxwell; the Lairds of Lundy, Pitarrow, Dun, Cunninghamhead, Drumlanrig, and young Lethington;[5] and it was appointed that, until the commission from the king and queen's majesty had been sent from France, and the part which they had chosen was openly declared, six of the former council should sit continually in Edinburgh, for the administration of justice. If, however, any measure of importance involving the general interests of the kingdom was brought before them, no fewer than sixteen of the above number were bound to attend. The treaty of Berwick, which had been entered into between Elizabeth and the Lords of the Congregation, was next confirmed,[6]

[1] Seized.

[2] Knox, p. 276.

[3] Original Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 27th August 1560. Keith, p. 151.

[4] Keith, pp. 151, 152.

[5] Keith, from a work entitled "Memoirs of Scotland," vol. i. fol. 168, preserved in the Scottish College at Paris, now unfortunately lost amongst the MSS. of that ancient house.

[6] The Lord James, for himself and the contractors, protested that they might have

and it was proposed that, as the surest basis of a perpetual amity between the two realms, an overture for a marriage between the Earl of Arran, eldest son to the Duke of Chastelherault, heir-apparent to the throne, and Queen Elizabeth should be sent to England. It was earnestly recommended by Lethington, that, until they understood in what manner Cecil was affected towards this measure, no hasty proceedings should take place; but although much disunion existed on other subjects, a singular unanimity appears to have here pervaded the assembly; and it was resolved, "that suit should be made to the Queen of England, in the best manner, that it may please her majesty, for the establishing of a perpetual friendship, to join in marriage with the Earl of Arran."[1] It was, last of all, determined that Sir James Sandilands of Calder, grand-prior of the Knights of St John of Jerusalem within Scotland, should carry an account of their proceedings to France; whilst Lethington, with the Earls of Morton and Glencairn, should be sent on the same errand to Elizabeth. Having brought these important matters to a conclusion, the parliament was dissolved on the 27th of August.[2]

On his arrival at the French court, Sir James Sandilands[3] was received with the utmost coldness. Nor could the Congregation have expected it to be otherwise. He brought intelligence to the Queen of Scotland that, without waiting for her ratification of the treaty concluded by her commissioners, or giving her time to send her commission for the calling a parliament, the three estates had assembled of their own authority, and by a series of acts more sweeping than any that had ever passed in the preceding history of the country, had introduced innovations which it was impossible could be regarded without alarm; they had overturned the established religion, and let loose against all who ventured to adhere to the belief of their fathers the fury of religious persecution; they had entered into a league with another kingdom; and, as if conscious of the illegal nature of their proceedings, had attempted to protect themselves against the punishment of the laws, by giving a pretended parliamentary sanction to the most violent of their measures. The truth of these assertions could not be denied; and when the young queen, and her advisers the Guises, contrasted the conduct of the parliament towards Elizabeth with the manner in which they treated their sovereign, to whom they pretended all loyalty and affection, they could not fail to be mortified with the difference. So completely were English interests predominant in the assembly of the estates, that Lethington and Moray in all important measures received the advice of Elizabeth and her ministers; and so far was this carried, that Cecil drew up and transmitted to them the scroll of the act which was to be passed in their assembly.[4] In an interview which took place, soon after Sandilands' arrival, between Throckmorton, the English ambassador, and the Cardinal Lorraine, the feelings of this proud minister upon the subject were strongly intimated. "I will tell you frankly," said the cardinal, "the Scots, the king's subjects, do perform no part of their duties; the king and the queen have the name of their sovereigns, and

an instrument that this their act was allowed to be good, lawful, and not prejudicial to the crown of Scotland. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 27th August 1560.

[1] Original MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 18th August 1560. Also, Acts of Parliament, vol. ii. p. 605.

[2] Keith is at a loss to know how long they sat after the 24th. The point is settled by a letter of Lethington to Cecil, MS. State-paper Office, Original, 27th August 1560.—"Although our Parliament be not ended, it is for the present on good respects dissolved."

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 7th September 1560. "The Lord St John departeth, as it is said, the 12th of this present."

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 29th August, 1560, Lethington to Cecil. It appears by this letter, that Cecil had framed the draft of an act for the Scottish parliament, confirming the treaty of Berwick, but it came too late. Their own act, however, was the same in substance, and almost in words.

your mistress hath the effect and the obedience. They would bring the realm to a republic, and say, in their words, they are the king's subjects; to tell you of the particular disorders were too long—every man doth what he lists. All this is too far out of order; and when fault is found with them, they threaten the king with the aid of the queen your mistress. Let your mistress either make them obedient subjects, or let her rid her hands of them; for rather than they shall be at this point, the king will quit all. They have made a league with the queen your mistress without us: what manner of dealing is this of subjects? Thereupon it is they bear themselves so proudly. . . They have sent hither a mean man, in post to the king and queen their sovereigns, and to the queen your mistress a great and solemn legation. . . This great legation, quoth he, goeth for the marriage of the queen your mistress with the Earl of Arran. What shall she have with him? I think her heart too great to marry with such a one as he is; and one of the queen's subjects."[1]

Immediately after this, the English ambassador was admitted to an audience of the young Queen of France. It is interesting to observe Mary's first appearance. Throckmorton entreated her to ratify the treaty, and complained that this had been too long deferred.—"Such answer," said the young queen, "as the king, my lord and husband, and his council, hath made you in that matter might suffice; but, because you shall know I have reason to do as I do, I will tell you what moveth me to refuse to ratify the treaty: my subjects in Scotland do their duty in nothing, nor have they performed one point that belongeth unto them. I am their queen, and so they call me; but they use me not so. They have done what pleaseth them; and though I have not many faithful subjects there, yet those few that be there on my party were not present when these matters were done, nor at this assembly. I will have them assemble by my authority, and proceed in their doings after the laws of the realm, which they so much boast of and keep none of them. They have sent hither a poor gentleman to me, whom I disdain to have come in the name of them all to the king and me in such a legation. They have sent great personages to your mistress. I am their sovereign, but they take me not so. They must be taught to know their duties." "In this speech," continues Throckmorton, "the queen uttered some choler and stomach against them. I said, 'As to the Lord of St John, I know him not; but he is Great Prior of Scotland, and you know by others what rank that estate hath, equal to any earl within your realm'.—The queen answered, 'I do not take him for Great Prior, for he is married; I marvel how it happeneth they could send other manner of men to your mistress.'—I said, 'Madam, I have heard that if your majesty do proceed graciously with the Lord St John, in observation of all that which was by the Bishop of Valence and Mons. de Randan promised in the king's and your name, the nobles and states of Scotland do mind to send unto the king and you a greater legation.'—'Then the king and I,' quoth she, 'must begin with them.'—'Madam,' quoth I, 'I am sorry the ratification of the treaty is refused; for that matter, together with other injuries offered to the queen my mistress, (as, contrary to the express articles of the treaty, the king and you do bear openly the arms of England,) will give the queen, my mistress, occasion greatly to suspect your well meaning unto her.'—'Mine uncles,' quoth she, 'have sufficiently answered you in this matter; and for your part, I pray you, do the office of a good minister betwixt us, and so shall you do well.' And so," concludes Throckmorton, "the queen dismissed me, and Mons. de Lansac brought me to my horse."[2]

[1] MS. Letter, French Correspondence, State-paper Office, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 17th November 1560.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to Queen Elizabeth, 17th November 1560. The letter, which has never been printed, is highly interesting.

When it is recollected that the young queen was now only sixteen, it must be admitted that in this conversation with one of the ablest ministers of Elizabeth she acquitted herself with uncommon spirit and good sense. Nor can we blame either her or the Guises for their steady refusal to ratify the treaty. Her commissioners, Monluc and Randan, had received positive instructions from Mary to treat with England, but not to include her Scottish subjects, or recognise their league with Elizabeth; yet they suffered themselves to be overreached by the crafty diplomacy of Cecil, and not only included them, but virtually recognised their whole proceedings. Encouraged by this, the Protestants had assembled a parliament; had adjourned for so short a period that it was impossible for the ratification and commission of their sovereign to arrive; had hurried forward its proceedings; formed a council of regency, composed chiefly of those who were opposed to France; entered anew into the league with England; and lastly, had directed to that country an embassy, the object of which was to place themselves under the guidance and protection of Elizabeth. When Lord St John arrived, therefore, and in the name of the Congregation requested the queen to confirm these proceedings, we need not be surprised that he met with a positive and somewhat peremptory refusal. But although Mary complained of his inferior rank, as compared with Glencairn, Morton, and Lethington, the ambassadors to England, St John was received with courtesy. He was admitted to an audience with the young queen and the Cardinal of Lorraine; exhorted, with earnestness, to act the part of an upright minister between his sovereign and her subjects; and dismissed with a letter addressed by the king and queen to the estates of Scotland.[1] Before his departure, however, Sandilands, alarmed at the prospects of the Congregation, had a private interview with the English ambassador, in which he entreated him to recommend "the ordering of their affairs in Scotland" to the English queen, observing, that unless she undertook the management, he foresaw that they would inevitably fall out amongst themselves and be undone.[2]

The secret policy of France at this period towards Scotland was watched and detected by Throckmorton with much ability. The Guises had resolved at present to remain at peace, and wait till they discovered in what manner Elizabeth received the embassy which was to propose to her a marriage with Arran. If she declined the match, and treated the overtures of the Protestants with coldness, they determined to sow jealousies between the reformers and their patroness; to persuade the Scots that she had acted solely from a desire to aggrandise herself; and induce them to continue the old amity with France. With this view, they proposed to detach Arran from the Congregation by high offers: he was to marry a daughter of France, to be made lieutenant for the king and queen in Scotland, to have the whole revenue of that realm for his entertainment, and to want nothing but the name of a king.[3] If, on the other

[1] Letter, MS. State-paper Office, French Correspondence, 17th November 1560, and 28th November 1560, to the Queen. I am the more careful to note the manner of his reception and dismissal—which I take from Throckmorton, who was on the spot, and in daily intercourse with him—because it has been erroneously stated that "the Cardinal of Lorraine loaded him with reproaches, accused him of perjury, denominated his friends execrable heretics, and dismissed him without an answer." This is the account of Dr Cook, (History of the Reformation, vol. ii. pp. 341, 342,) who was misled by Keith, whilst Keith was himself misled by Buchanan. Contrast this with the following passage from Throckmorton's Letter of 28th November 1560, to Queen Elizabeth:—"The Lord St John had his dépesche here the 26th of this month. He took not his leave of the king by reason of his indisposition, but of the queen and the Cardinal Lorraine. He had very good words, and was required to use the part and office of a good minister towards the estates of Scotland, and of a good subject towards his sovereigns. He hath a letter from the king and queen to the said estates, the copy whereof I send your majesty herewith."

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 28th November 1560.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French

hand, they found the queen disposed to follow the advice of Cecil, and entertain the league of mutual friendship and defence with Scotland, they had projected to weaken the Congregation, by creating jealousies amongst its leaders, to sow dissension between Arran and the Lord James, and to bestow the whole of the benefices and offices of the kingdom in raising a party against England. To traverse these schemes, the English ambassador advised Elizabeth to employ Clark, one of the archers of the French guard, a subtle and intriguing agent of his, who had been bred up as a spy in France; he accordingly left that country with letters of recommendation to the queen, and being sent into Scotland, pursued his treacherous vocation with great activity and success.[1]

Although the policy of the Guisian faction was for the moment watchful and pacific, their motive was merely to gain time: their main purpose continued the same as before—the destruction of the party of the Reformation in Europe. To put down the Huguenots in France, to encourage the Romanists in England and Scotland, to sow dissensions amongst the Protestant princes of Germany, to support the Council of Trent now sitting, and, in a word, to concentrate the whole strength of France, Spain, Italy, and the Empire, against that great moral and religious revolution, by which light and truth were struggling to free themselves from the trammels of many long-established errors, was the chief object to which they directed their efforts.

Under the regency of the queen-dowager, the affairs of Scotland had been intrusted principally to D'Osell, a man of talent and a good officer, but rash and overbearing. On the return, however, of Monluc, bishop of Valence, with Martignes, to the French court, D'Osell, who it was generally supposed would have the chief voice in Scottish affairs, lost the royal favour, and found himself entirely passed over. The cause of his disgrace, as stated by Throckmorton, in a letter to Elizabeth, presents us with an appalling picture of the dark policy of the Guises. At the commencement of the religious troubles in Scotland, the Bishop of Amiens, De la Brosse, and Martignes, advised the queen-dowager to dissemble with the Congregation, to call a parliament at Leith or Edinburgh, and having got the chief leaders under one roof, to seize and put to death the most violent.[2] The queen-regent revolted from so base a proposal, and D'Osell compelled his less scrupulous associates to abandon it. But he now reaped the consequences: the prelate arraigned him as the origin of all the ill success in Scotland, and he found himself deprived of the favour of his sovereign.[3]

At this interesting crisis, when the Congregation regarded with anxiety the designs which were meditating against them; when Elizabeth hesitated upon the expediency of continuing to give them her active support, and the Guises waited only "till they had got money in their purses to follow their enterprises,"[4] an event took place which drew after it important changes. The young French king, Francis the Second, who had for some time laboured under a languishing state of health, expired at Orleans on the 6th of December.[5] His youthful consort, the Scottish queen, by whom he was ardently beloved, had watched over him with devoted care and affection, and for some time appeared inconsolable; but the energy of her character soon recovered its ascend-

Correspondence, 10th October 1560, Throckmorton to the Lords of the Council.

1 MS. Letter, French Correspondence, State-paper Office, Throckmorton to the Queen, 28th November 1560.

2 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to the Queen, 10th October 1560.

3 Ibid., Poissy.

4 Ibid., Throckmorton to the Council.

5 I note the day, as it is differently stated by our general historians. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, 6th December 1560. Throckmorton to Elizabeth. "The 6th of this present, at 11 o'clock of the night, he departed to God."

ency, and recalled her to the duties she had to perform, and the difficulties by which she was surrounded. Throckmorton, an eye-witness of her behaviour, soon after the event, addressed the following letter to the council, which contains an interesting view, not only of the character of the young queen, but a sketch, by the hand of a master, of the position of parties, and the projected policy of England. "My very good lords: Now that God hath thus disposed of the late French king, whereby the Scottish queen is left a widow, in my simple judgment, one of the special things your lordships have to consider, and to have an eye to, is the marriage of that queen. During her husband's life there was no great account made of her; for that, being under band of marriage and subjection of her husband, who carried the burden and care of all her matters, there was offered no great occasion to know what was in her. But since her husband's death, she hath shewed, and so continueth, that she is both of great wisdom for her years, modesty, and also of great judgment, in the wise handling herself and her matters; which, increasing in her with her years, cannot but turn to her commendation, reputation, honour, and great benefit of her and her country. And already it appeareth, that some such as made no great account of her, do now, seeing her wisdom, both honour and pity her.

"Immediately upon her husband's death, she changed her lodging, withdrew herself from all company, became so solitary and exempt of all worldliness, that she doth not to this day see daylight, and thus will continue out forty days. For the space of fifteen days after the death of her said husband, she admitted no man to come unto her chamber, but the king, his brethren, the King of Navarre, the constable, and her uncles. About four or five days after that, she was content to admit some bishops, and the ancient knights of the order, and none of the younger, saving Martignes, who having done her good service, and married the chief gentlewoman of her chamber, had so much favour shewed him among the rest. The ambassadors also were lastly admitted, as they came, who have been all with her to condole, saving I, which I have forborne to do, knowing not the queen's majesty's pleasure in that behalf.

"Amongst others, the ambassador of Spain hath been with her above an hour together, which is thought to be for more than the ceremony of condoling required. He hath also since that time dined, and had great conference with the Cardinal of Lorraine; and though I cannot yet think that it be about any matter of marriage for her with the Prince of Spain—for I think the Council of Spain too wise to think upon it without other commodity—yet, it is not amiss to hearken to the matter; for she, using herself as she beginneth, will make herself to be beloved, and to lack no good means of offers. But to conclude herein: as long as the matter shall be well handled in England, and that now, in time, good occasions be not let pass, the king of Spain will have little mind that way. As for my part, I see her behaviour to be such, and her wisdom and queenly modesty so great, in that she thinketh herself not too wise, but is content to be ruled by good counsel and wise men, (which is a great virtue in a prince or princess, and which argueth a great judgment and wisdom in her,) that by these means she cannot do amiss. And I cannot but fear her proceedings with the time, if any means be left, and offered her to take advantage by.

"I understand very credibly," continued the ambassador, "that the said Scottish queen is desirous to return into Scotland: marry, she would so handle the matter as that the desire should not seem nor appear to come of herself, nor of her seeking, but by the request and suit of the subjects of Scotland. To compass which device she hath sent one Robert Lesley (who pretendeth title to the earldom of Rothes) into Scotland, to work by such as are hers; and besides them, doubteth nothing to procure to her a

good many of those that were lately against her; and among others, she holdeth herself sure of the Lord James, and of all the Stewards, wholly to be at her devotion. She mistrusteth none but the Duke of Chastelherault and his party; and besides these, she nothing doubteth to assure to her, with easy persuasions, the whole, or the most part, of those that carried themselves indifferently as neuters all this while, who are thought to be many besides the common people. And now to have their queen home [they] will altogether, she thinketh, lean and incline to her. Upon request, thus to be made to her by these nobles, requiring to have her return; she will demand that the principal forts and holds of the realm be delivered into her hands, or to such for her as she will appoint, to the end that she may be more assured against the evil meaning of the hollow-hearted, or such as fear the worst towards themselves. She doth also work that those that shall thus request her to come into Scotland, shall offer and promise all obedience and duty belonging to loving and obedient subjects; whom she will, for her part, recompense by all the favour, assurance, and benevolence that a prince can promise and owe to good subjects. This matter, my lords, being worth good consideration, I leave to your lordships' grave wisdoms to consider of it."[1]

The news of the young king's death was received by the party of the Congregation in Scotland with extraordinary exultation. The ministers not only justly considered the event as a great deliverance, but in the intolerant spirit of the times, represented it as a special judgment inflicted upon an infidel and stubborn prince.[2] Throckmorton, with greater charity, called upon his royal mistress to thank God, who by these incomprehensible means had provided for her surety and quietness.[3] Lethington, with the quick prospective glance of a statesman, pronounced that the king's death must have the effect of changing materially the line of their policy;[4] whilst the leaders of the opposite parties, which had so long separated the state, transmitted assurances of fidelity, and offers of service, to their youthful sovereign.

In the meantime, all agreed that a parliament must be summoned; and the three estates having assembled at Edinburgh on the 16th of January, Lord St John, who had been overtaken on his journey by the news of the king's death, laid before them the letter with which he had been intrusted by their sovereign and her late husband. It informed them that their envoy had assured her of their earnest wish to remain faithful and obedient subjects; but in the account which she had received of the proceedings of their late assembly, (so she termed the parliament in which they had established the reformed faith,) she lamented to observe how far their conduct had deviated from their professions. Yet so anxious was she for their return to their duty, that she had resolved to despatch two noble persons as her envoys into Scotland, bearing her commission to convene a legal parliament, in which their requests should be fully considered, and their faults buried and forgotten.[5]

It was evident to the Lords of the Congregation, that the king's death, which happened three weeks after this letter was written, must have the effect of altering, in a great degree, the

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to the Council, 31st December 1560.

[2] "When all things," says Knox, "were in readiness to shed the blood of innocents; the Eternal, our God, who ever watcheth for the preservation of His own, began to work, and suddenly did put His own work in execution; for as the king sat at mass, he was suddenly struck with an aposthume, in that deaf ear which would never hear the truth of God. . . . When his glory perished, and the pride of his stubborn heart evanished in smoke."—Knox, p. 280.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 6th December 1560.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 6th February 1560-1, Scots Correspondence.

[5] MS. Letter, copy, State-paper Office, Orleans, 17th November 1560.

mutual relations between them and their sovereign; they saw, at the same time, that much would depend upon the policy of England; and they therefore turned with anxiety to receive the reply of Elizabeth to their late embassy.[1] It was favourable, so far as she assured them that their thankful acceptance of her assistance, and the good fruits which had resulted from it, would encourage her to proffer the same aid, should they ever require it in their defence. She declined the offer of marriage with the Earl of Arran, but in terms flattering to the estates and to himself, acknowledging their goodwill in offering to her the choicest person whom they had, and pronouncing him a noble gentleman of great worthiness: she concluded by earnestly recommending unanimity amongst themselves, warning them of the practices which might still be attempted against them, and (with a glance towards France) declared her readiness to enter into a common defence against any common enemy.[2]

Having weighed these answers, it was determined by the parliament that their sovereign, who was now unfettered by any ties to France, should be invited to return to her own dominions, and that her brother, the Lord James, the chief leader of the Congregation, should instantly proceed as an ambassador to that kingdom, to declare their wishes upon this point. It might have been imagined that this potent person, who had made himself so obnoxious to the Guisian faction, would have declined this dangerous mission. But although the task was delicate and difficult, there were circumstances which convinced him, that if he was to retain the power he now possessed, he must embrace it. The Earl of Huntly, the head of the Roman Catholic party, his principal rival, and the only man whose strength and abilities he dreaded, had already assembled his friends, and he was anxious to anticipate any message they might send to France.[3] Even before the king's death, the Lord James had entered into a correspondence with the young queen, in which he solicited the renewal of his French pension; and, in reply, Mary had assured him, that if he would return to his duty, not only the pension awaited him, but the highest favours that could be conferred, whether he disposed himself to be ecclesiastical or temporal.[4]

But whilst he thus prepared the way for a reconciliation with his own sovereign, and hoped to be intrusted with the principal management of her affairs, the Lord James had no intention of deserting the lucrative service of England. At the same moment he applied, through Throckmorton, to Cecil, requesting a recompense out of some abbey, or pension in his own country, for the losses he had sustained.[5] He resolved also to visit London on his road to France, and, in an interview with Elizabeth, to acquaint that princess with the purport of his message, and the course of conduct which he and his party had determined to follow. If the Congregation found that their sovereign, listening to the counsel of the house of Guise, which had already occasioned a civil war, meant to renew its horrors by bringing with her a foreign force, they had resolved not to receive her, but to communicate the matter to the Queen of England, who, says Lethington, will have power to command what she thinketh rathest[6] to be fol-

[1] The Ambassadors returned 3d January, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 3d January 1560-1.

[2] British Museum, Caligula, book x. folio 133. A copy from the original in Lord Burleigh's hand. 8th December 1560. Printed in Keith, p. 156.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Scots Correspondence, Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, 23d December 1560. Also, original MS. State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 7th September 1560. Also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, original, Randolph to Cecil, 23d September 1560.

[4] MS. Letter, French Correspondence, State-paper Office, 29th November 1560, Throckmorton to Queen Elizabeth.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to Cecil, 29th November 1560. "If," says Throckmorton, "the allotment of his recompense could be so used as the Earl of Arran might be seen to be the principal doer thereof, it would, in my opinion, do no harm."

[6] Rathest, earliest—if used in its old English meaning; but here, from the context, it

lowed, without whose advice, he adds, "we dare not enterprise any great thing."[1] If, on the contrary, Mary was content to come home, unaccompanied by any foreign force, and to repose her confidence in her own subjects, he was to assure her of their loyalty and affection, and to advise her to take her journey through England, where she might have an interview with Elizabeth, and from which her subjects would accompany her honourably to her own country.

One difficulty remained on the subject of religion. The young queen rigidly adhered to the Roman Catholic faith, yet it had by parliament been pronounced death for any one to hear mass; and the ministers of the Kirk admonished him, that if he consented that she should have that service performed either publicly or privately they would consider him as betraying the cause of God, and exposing religion to the utmost peril. He answered that he should never consent to the establishment of this idolatrous worship in public, but that he could not consent to the violent advice of those who would stop her from the private exercise of her own form of worship.[2] Having thus received his instructions, the parliament was prorogued till the 21st of May.

At the same time that the three estates committed this important mission to the Lord James, a secret convention was held by the Catholic party, which was attended by the Archbishop of St Andrews, the Bishops of Aberdeen, Moray, and Ross; the Earls of Huntly, Athole, Crawford, Sutherland, Marshal, Caithness, and many other barons, who intrusted Lesley, then official of Aberdeen and afterwards Bishop of Ross, with a commission to repair to the French court, and present to their sovereign their offers of service and expressions of devoted attachment.

The departure of both envoys, however, was delayed by the arrival of four commissioners from the queen.[3] These were Preston of Craigmillar, Ogilvy of Findlater, Lumsden of Blanearn, and Lesley of Auchtermuchty. The message which they brought from their royal mistress was full of affection and conciliation. She assured them that she meant shortly to return home; that all offences should be forgiven, and that the few French soldiers who still remained in garrison within Dunbar and the Inch should be sent out of the country. She informed them that offers of marriage had been already made to her on the part of the Prince of Spain and the Kings of Sweden and Denmark, but that she had resolved to entertain none of these proposals till she could in person consult her nobles, and receive the assent of her people. To them she looked, and to their support, as the only sure foundation of her greatness.[4] They presented at the same time a commission directed to seven leading men in Scotland—the Duke of Chastelherault, Argyle, Athole, Huntly, Bothwell, the Lord James, and the Archbishop of St Andrews—directing them to summon a parliament, and notifying that the French king had resolved to despatch Monsieur de Noailles to propose to the three estates the renewal of the ancient league between France and Scotland, a proposal which met with her hearty concurrence. Mary seized this moment earnestly to recommend to her subjects, of all parties, the duty of mutual forbearance and forgiveness. She addressed letters to almost every leading man in Scotland, assuring those who had most offended against her that she was determined to forget all injuries, and to continue them in their offices of trust if they would but faithfully serve her.[5]

At the time when these messengers arrived from the queen, Scotland was

seems rather to be used in the sense of "preferable."

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 6th February 1560–1.

[2] British Museum, MS. Calderwood, vol. i. p. 458.

[3] 20th February 1560-1.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 26th February 1560-1.

[5] MS. Letter, French Correspondence, State-paper Office, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 23d January 1560-1. MS. Instructions to the four Commissioners, State-paper Office, without date.

divided, as we are informed by the Secretary Lethington, into three parties.[1] The first he denominates the neutrals, who, as they were before this careless of the commonweal, were now ready to receive whatever was propounded to them under the shadow of the prince's command, without examination either of its justice or its consequences. The second faction consisted of the Duke of Chastelherault and the friends of his house: he considered his only security to be a marriage between Arran, his eldest son, and Mary. In advising this the sole councillor and confidant of Arran was Knox; to promote it Forbes, a confidential friend of the Hamiltons, had already proceeded on a secret mission to France, and although the queen was too cautious to commit herself, the messenger was received with favour, and an answer returned which at least did not extinguish his hopes.[2] The third party is described by the same acute statesman, himself an eye-witness and principal leader amongst them, as important alike in numbers, rank, and power. It was their opinion that every method should be adopted to persuade their sovereign to return into her own realm, where they were ready to secure for her a favourable reception, under the single condition that she came without a foreign force, and was content to govern by her own subjects. If she consented to this it was his belief that ways would easily be found to induce her to favour the religion, confirm the treaty with England, and reform all abuses. Lethington concluded the letter which gives us this information by pointing out to Cecil the dangers which must follow the renewal of the league with France, and anticipated his own certain ruin if the amity with England were dissolved. "I pray you," says he, "consider what danger it is for me to write. Many men's eyes look upon me; my familiarity with that realm is known, and so far misliked, that I learn it shall be my undoing, unless the queen may be made favourable to England, which I fear shall be hard to do."[3] Nor was he singular in this opinion, the whole party of the Congregation looking to Elizabeth as their surest protection against the designs of France and the anticipated resentment of their sovereign.

On the first intelligence of the death of Francis, this princess prepared to pursue that cautious and double policy which should preserve her interest in Scotland at the least possible expense to herself. She despatched the Earl of Bedford to present her condolences to Mary, and to assure her of her warmest wishes for the continuance of peace between her own kingdom and Scotland, but to require at the same time the confirmation of the treaty of Edinburgh, concluded by her commissioners, and of which the ratification, she contended, had been delayed on frivolous pretences.[4] It was to be a main part of Bedford's duty to persuade the queen to give the same freedom to her country that it had enjoyed during the reign of her father, James the Fifth, which consisted chiefly in its being governed by its own laws, and ruled by means of its "natural or born" people. He was to remind her how quiet the kingdom had remained since the removal of the French troops; to declare that for the last hundred years the Borders had not enjoyed so much peace as at present; and if he discovered any disposition in the house of Guise to promote her marriage with Spain or Austria, he was to incite the King of Navarre and the Protestant party in France to oppose it as contrary to his own greatness and the best interests of Christendom.[5] Soon after this Elizabeth instructed Randolph, then resident as her envoy at the Scottish capital, in the policy which he ought to pursue. He was directed to inform the leaders of the Protestants of the league lately re-

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 26th Feb. 1560-1, Lethington to Cecil.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 3d Jan. 1560-1.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 26th February 1560-1.

[4] MS. Instructions, State-paper Office, Sir J. Williamson's Collection, first series, vol. xix. p. 547, 20th January 1560-1.

[5] Ibid.

newed amongst the princes of Germany for their mutual defence against the pope and his adherents, and to show them how earnestly they had exhorted her to continue firm in her religion. He was to express her determination to adhere to the great principles of the Reformation, to exhort the Scottish reformers to labour for the continuance of the peace with England, and to persuade them against the renewal of the ancient unprofitable alliance with France.[1]

Bedford arrived at Paris on the 3d of February, and on the 15th of that month proceeded to the court at Fontainebleau, where he delivered his message to the Scottish queen.[2] He was received by Mary with the courteous and winning manners for which she was so remarkable: she expressed her kindly feelings towards Elizabeth, and her desire to remain in amity with England, but steadily declined to ratify the treaty of Edinburgh[3] till she had returned to her kingdom and consulted the wishes of her parliament. The interview is minutely described in an original letter of Bedford and Throckmorton to the Privy-council. They were conducted to the presence of the Queen of Scotland by D'Osell, who had been restored to favour and made her knight of honour; and, on being pressed to show her desire of peace with Elizabeth, by confirming the treaty of Edinburgh without more delay, Mary replied, "that there were more reasons to persuade to amity between Elizabeth her good sister and herself, than between any two princes in all Christendom; we are both (said she) in one isle, both of one language, both the nearest kinswomen that each other hath, and both queens. As to the treaty of Edinburgh, I am here, (she continued,) as you see, without all counsel; my uncle, (the Cardinal of Lorraine,) who hath the ordering of all my affairs, and by whom (as reason is) I ought to be advised, is not here presently; and, Mons. l'Ambassadeur, it is also the queen my good sister's advice, that I should take the counsel of the nobles and wise men of mine own realm, as hath been declared by you unto me. You know well enough, (quoth she,) here are none of them, but I look to have some of them here shortly; and then will I make the queen such an answer as she will be pleased with." The Earl of Bedford again insisted that she was bound in honour immediately to grant a ratification, which had been already too long delayed. "Helas! my lord," interrupted Mary, "what would you have me do? I have no council here; the matter is great to ratify a treaty; and especially for one of my years:" she was then eighteen. The sagacious Throckmorton then attempted to reply to these reasonable scruples: "Madam," said he, "Mons. de Guise, your uncle, is here present, by whom, I think, as reason is, you will be advised. I see others here also of whom you have been pleased to take counsel; the matter is not such but that you may proceed without any great delay, seeing it hath been promised so often that it should be ratified." "Helas! Mons. l'Ambassadeur, (quoth she,) for those things that were done in my late husband's time, I am not to be charged, for then I was under his obedience; and now I would be loath to do anything unadvisedly; but because it is a great matter, I pray you give me respite till I speak with you again;" with which answer the ambassadors were contented for the time. But when taking their leave Mary recalled Throckmorton; "Mons. l'Ambassadeur," said she pleasantly, "I have to challenge you with breach of promise: you can remember that you promised me, in case I would send to the queen my good sister my picture, that I should have hers in recompense thereof; and because I made no small account of the same, I was very glad that that condition was offered me to have it.

[1] Haynes, State Papers, p. 366, 17th March 1560-1.

[2] State-paper Office, French Correspondence, 12th February, 1560-1; also State-paper Office, Sir J. Williamson's Collection, first series, vol. xix. p. 585, Report of Bedford and Throckmorton to the Privy-council.

[3] Supra, p. 123.

You know I have sent mine to the queen my good sister according to my promise, but have not received hers: I pray you, therefore, procure that I may have it, whereof I am so desirous, and now more than before, that I shall think the time long till I have it."

On the morrow, Bedford and Throckmorton having obtained a second audience, reminded Mary of her promise to give them her final answer: "My lord," quoth the queen, "inasmuch as I have none of the nobles of my realm of Scotland here, to take advice of, by whom the queen, my good sister, doth advise me to be counselled, I dare not, nor think not good, to ratify this said treaty; and, as you know, if I should do any act that might concern the realm, without their advice and counsel, it were like [likely] I should have them such subjects unto me, as I have had them. But for all such matters as be past, I have forgotten them; and at the queen my good sister's desire I have pardoned them, trusting that I shall find them hereafter, by her good means, better and more loving subjects than they have been. Whether I have cause to think amiss of them or no, I durst put it to her judgment. This, my lord, I pray you think concerning the ratification of the treaty: I do not refuse to ratify it because I do not mind to do it;[1] nor I use not these delays as excuses to shift off the matter; for if my counsel were here, I would give you such an answer as should satisfy you. And I pray you to tell the queen, my good sister, I trust, ere it be long, some of the nobility and council of Scotland will be here, for I do hear they mean to send some shortly unto me: *peradventure you know it as well as I.* And when I shall have communed with them, I mind to send my good sister the queen, your mistress, such an answer as I trust she shall be pleased with it; for I mean to send one of mine own unto her ere it be long. In the meantime, I pray you, declare unto her from me, that I would we might speak together, and then I trust we should satisfy each other much better than we can do by messages and ministers. This the queen my sister may assure herself of, that she shall find none more willing to embrace her friendship and amity than I; and there is none that ought to take more place with her than me. She can consider in what state I am in, and what need I have to have the amity of such a one as she is. Tell her, I pray you, how much I am desirous to see her, and also that I am in good hope it will come to pass." "And thus," concluded the ambassadors in their letter to the Privy-council, "after many good words to and fro, we took our leave of her: marry she forgot not to pray us both once again to remember to procure that she might have the queen's majesty's picture."[2]

Not long after the return of Bedford, the Lord James having consulted with Lethington and his party on the policy which they should pursue, repaired to the English court; there in an interview with Elizabeth, who pressed him to procure the ratification of the treaty of Edinburgh, he assured that princess, that in his present visit to the queen his sister he bore no public commission; it was dictated, he said, solely by his own private feelings; and the only message he conveyed from the nobility and council was a general declaration of their duty and devotion to their sovereign.[3] But although Moray declined to press Mary on this subject of the treaty, he did not fail to inform Elizabeth minutely regarding the intended proceedings of himself and his friends. "The Lord James," said Lethington, addressing Cecil, and alluding to the journey, "mindeth to sue to the queen's majesty [Elizabeth] for a passport,

[1] She means to say, "My present refusal does not proceed from any resolution not to ratify it."

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office. The Earl of Bedford and Sir N. Throckmorton, to the Privy-council, 26th February 1560-1. Sir J. Williamson's Collection, vol. xix. p. 54.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Elizabeth to Sir N. Throckmorton, draft by Cecil, 29th March 1561. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Scots Correspondence, 7th Feb. 1560, the Lord James to Cecil.

and in his passage to make her highness participant as well of that he hath in charge as what he mindeth to do. You know somewhat of his nature, and I dare undertake that he is no dissembler."[1] With Cecil also the same ambitious and able man held a private consultation; and it is curious to observe that between two such consummate politicians as Cecil and Throckmorton there existed a difference of opinion as to the propriety of permitting him to take his journey into France. Throckmorton, then minister at the French court, a witness to the skilfulness of Guisian diplomacy, and not insensible to the fascination of the manners of the young queen, dreaded that he would be gained over by the bribes which were preparing for him; or, should his integrity or his self-interest resist these temptations, that some means would be found to detain him in France. "I understand," says this ambassador, in a letter to Queen Elizabeth, "that the Lord James of Scotland is appointed to come hither to the Queen of Scotland. I am very sorry for it, and so shall be still, till I see the contrary of that fall out, which I yet fear by his coming. I learn that this king, by means of the Queen of Scotland, deviseth all the means he can to win him to his devotion; and for that purpose hath both procured the red hat for him if he will accept it, and also mindeth to endow him with good abbeys and benefices in this realm. If advancement or fair words shall win him, he shall not want the one or the other. If he so much esteem the religion he professeth, and the honour of his country and himself that none of these things shall win him to this devotion, then it is to be feared that they will work ways to keep him still by fair or foul means. . . . . On the other side, if he will be won, then your majesty knoweth he may be, and it is like he will be, the most perilous man to your majesty and your realm of all the realm of Scotland, and most able to stand this king in his best stead for the matters there: so that his coming cannot but prejudice every way; and I believe verily if he come, he will not return into Scotland so soon as he thinketh."[2]

Cecil, however, knew that the Lord James was devotedly attached to England. From the correspondence with Lethington, he was aware that both Maitland and he considered their own safety as inseparably connected with the maintenance of their fidelity to Elizabeth; and having concerted their measures together, the English secretary felt little disposition to distrust the Scottish envoy, but treating him with the highest courtesy, dismissed him with earnest injunctions to attend to his personal safety.[3]

Having arrived at Paris, Moray found that the queen his sovereign was then at Rheims, to which place he proceeded, after having consulted with Throckmorton, and delivered to that minister the letters he had received from Cecil.[4] He found himself anticipated by Lesley the envoy of Huntley, who professed to represent the Catholic party. This able man, the very day before her brother was admitted, had solicited and obtained an interview with the Queen. It seems, however, to have produced little effect upon the mind of Mary. She had been impressed with an unfavourable opinion of Huntley, from his late wavering and crafty conduct. Although he professed an unshaken attachment to the Romish faith, and made the warmest professions of loyalty to his sovereign, this powerful noble had, scarcely a year before, joined the party of the Congregation, upon an understanding that he should be supported in his power in the north, and share in the ecclesiastical prizes which the leaders were then dividing

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, Feb. 6, 1560-1.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to the Queen, Paris, March 31, 1561.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Cecil to Throckmorton, April 4, 1561.

[4] He arrived some time before the 9th of April, and did not see his sovereign the queen, till the 14th of the same month. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to Cecil, 9th April 1561.

amongst them.[1] When, therefore, Lesley brought from him his assurances of fidelity, warned his mistress to beware of the intrigues and ambition of her brother the Lord James, and hinted that he had designs against the crown, it is not surprising that Mary listened to his communication with incredulity.[2] She, however, received the envoy with kindness, and commanded him to remain near her person.[3]

To Moray her behaviour was more warm and confidential. He came to her, as he stated, not with any public commission, but impelled by his affection, and anxious to offer her his services, as one who knew the state of parties in her dominions; and so completely did his blunt and open deportment impress her with an opinion of his integrity, that in a few days he had gained a decided influence over the mind of his sovereign. He appears, in his manner of managing this difficult mission, to have acted with great address and duplicity. His object, according to the expressive phrase of Lethington, was to "grope the mind of the young queen," and having discovered her intentions, to shape his counsels and his conduct so as best to secure the interests of the Congregation, the friendship of Elizabeth, and the preservation of his own power. Had Mary been aware that the man in whom she was about to confide had already made Elizabeth and Cecil participant in his intentions, and that nothing was to be done in Scottish matters without consulting the English queen, she would have hesitated before she gave entire credit to one so likely to abuse it; but of this she was ignorant; and the Catholic party, who had attempted to put her on her guard, were not themselves above suspicion. D'Osell, in whom she placed much confidence, was untrue to her; and, acting in the interest of Elizabeth,[4] advised her to confide implicitly in the Lord James. Her temper was open and unsuspicious; and one of the most fatal faults in her character was the facility with which her affections were engaged, and the dangerous and rapid reliance she was disposed to place in all whom she trusted. She listened, therefore, to her brother with a generous forgetfulness of the part which, as she believed, his conscientious adherence to the reformed faith had compelled him to take against her; and when he pressed her to return to her dominions, and assured her of a cordial welcome from himself and her subjects,[5] she flattered herself his protestations were sincere, and disclosed to him her intentions with an imprudent precipitation. She declared that she would never ratify the treaty of Edinburgh till she came into Scotland and took the advice of her parliament. She did not scruple to admit, that the amity between England and Scotland was little agreeable to her, and that, considering the terms of the league lately made betwixt the two realms, she was anxious to have it dissolved. It was evident also to the Lord James, from the expressions of the queen, that she would never marry the Earl of Arran; but was anxious to procure the consent of her subjects to a union with some foreign prince. She had sent her commands that no parliament should be assembled, and no business of importance concluded, till she had personally met with her people; and she confessed that her present intention was to return to Scotland, not through England, but by sea.[6]

Notwithstanding all this, there is reason to believe that an immediate return to her kingdom was not at this moment very anxiously desired by Mary. To leave France, where, as the queen of one of the first monarchies in Europe, she was accustomed

1 MS. State-paper Office, "My Lord of Huntley's desires and counsel," 18th April 1560.

2 Keith, p. 160.

3 Lesley, Bannatyne edition, p. 294.

4 This is quite apparent from the secret correspondence of Throckmorton and Cecil, in the State-paper Office.

5 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to Cecil, 26th July 1561, Paris.

6 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 29th April 1561.

to all the splendour and adulation attendant upon so high a rank, where she had been the attractive centre of a refined court, to repair to an inferior kingdom, inhabited by a ruder people, who spoke of her as an idolatress and an enemy, was sufficiently appalling. But other reasons weighed with her, and produced delay. Her hand was now solicited by some of the greatest princes on the Continent; and the same suitors who had courted Elizabeth, and whom that queen felt a pride in keeping in her train, now offered an unpardonable affront to her vanity by transferring their admiration to her beautiful rival. The King of Denmark, reputed to be by sea the strongest prince in Christendom, had offered to enter into a strict league with France, should he succeed in his addresses to Mary.[1] The King of Sweden had despatched an embassy proposing himself in marriage; and at this very time the jealous and busy eye of Throckmorton had detected a secret overture for a matrimonial alliance with the Prince of Spain, which created alarm to the English ambassador, and did not escape the watchful observation of the Lord James.[2] To gain time to conclude this negotiation was one great object of the Scottish queen; and with this view she was inclined to delay her immediate journey home, and intrust her affairs in the mean season to the management of the Lord James. But, prior to her final resolution, both the queen and the Guises endeavoured, with great earnestness, to induce him to embrace the creed of Rome. He was offered a cardinal's hat, and the highest advancement, should he prefer an ecclesiastical to a civil career; but he resisted every bribe, remaining true to the reformed faith and his engagements with England. This firmness in his purpose rather raised than lowered him in the esteem of the queen his sister. She imagined, but erroneously, that he who was thus guided by a conscientious adherence to the party of which he formed the head, would be equally true to her. She confided to him her intended measures regarding Scotland; and when he parted from her, she had promised him her commission to assume the government of the country till her arrival in her dominions, and engaged to send it to him by a gentleman whom he left behind for this purpose.[3]

On taking leave of his sovereign, the Lord James returned to Paris, and having secretly met the English ambassador, insidiously betrayed to him everything that had passed between Mary and himself. These particulars Throckmorton immediately communicated to Elizabeth,[4] observing that the Scottish lord would himself detail the circumstances more particularly to her majesty when he came to her presence. It is of importance at this moment, to the full understanding of the secret history of this period, to attend to some of the passages of the letter addressed by the ambassador to that princess. "At this present," (29th April 1561,) says he, "thanks be to God, your majesty hath peace with all the world, and I see no occasion to move unto your majesty or your realm, any war from any place or person, but by the Queen of Scotland and her means; neither do I see any danger that may grow to your realm but by Scotland. Then wisdom doth advise your majesty to buy your

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, March 31, 1561.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to Cecil, April 23, 1561.

[3] State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to the Queen, (Elizabeth,) 1st May 1561.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to the Queen, 29th April, 1561. It is to the preservation of this letter in the Correspondence of the State-paper Office that I owe the detection of Moray's intrigues with Elizabeth, and the disclosure of the duplicity with which he acted. I subjoin the passage which proves the assertion in the text, as it is of importance:—"When the Lord James, being the same day [22d April] arrived at this town, came to my lodging *secretly unto me*, and declared to me at good length all that had passed between the queen his sister and him, and between the Cardinal Lorraine and him. The circumstances whereof he will declare unto your majesty particularly when he cometh to your presence. I suppose he will be in England about the 10th or 12th of May."

surety, quietness, and felicity, though it cost you dear. The means to assure this is, in time, before any other put in his feet, his hire, and practices, to win unto your majesty's devotion and party, the mightiest, the wisest, and the most honest of the realm of Scotland. And though it be to your majesty great charge, as twenty thousand pounds yearly, yet it is in no wise to be omitted or spared. And in sorting your entertainment to every person, there should be some special consideration had of the Earl of Arran, because he is the second person of that realm, whose quality and credit your majesty knoweth better than I; and in like manner of the Lord James, whose credit, love, and honesty, is comparable, in my judgment, to any man of that realm. It is now your majesty's time, and never shall you have a better opportunity to work the Scottish affection to your devotion." Another passage from the same letter eulogising the Lord James, proves that Elizabeth had already, by some substantial consideration, or as Throckmorton expresses it, "some good turn," engaged him in her service; and demonstrates in strong language the system of corruption by which Throckmorton advised that the assistance of the leading lay reformers of Scotland should be secured. "Lastly," said he, "I do well perceive the Lord James to be a very honourable, sincere, and godly gentleman, and very much affected to your majesty, upon whom you never bestowed good turn better than on him, in my opinion. He is a man in my simple judgment, for many respects, much worthy to be cherished, and his amity to be well embraced and entertained: for besides his own well deserving, he is as well able to serve your majesty by himself and his friends, as any man there in Scotland; though the queen his sister will seek to bring in thither some puissant foreign power, to subject all upside down, or though she would seek to serve her turn and affection by some others of her nation that be inclined to greater legerity, inconstancy, and corruption. . . . . For if I be not greatly deceived, no man can tell yet, nor is able to ground a certain judgment, what shall become of the realm of Scotland. And therefore it shall be good for your majesty upon all events to retain and win as many friends there as you can, that if one will not serve your turn another may. There be attending here on the Lord James two men amongst others that are to be cherished by your majesty. The one is the Laird of Pitarrow, a grave wise man, and such a one as the Queen of Scotland, for God's cause and yours, doth much mislike. The other is Mr John Wood, secretary to the Lord James, a man in whom there is much virtue and sufficiency. There be two others which are well known to your majesty, which are in like case to be well cherished: the one is Alexander Clark, the other is Robert Melvin."[1] These passages sufficiently explain the extraordinary difficulties of Mary's situation, the venality of the times, and the lamentable want of principle in that class from which she was compelled to choose her counsellors.

The queen, on taking leave of her brother, had earnestly dissuaded him from visiting the French court or passing through England. She naturally dreaded the influence of the Protestant party in France, and of Elizabeth in England; and when she found that her wishes were not obeyed, she dismissed the gentleman, by whom he expected to receive the commission appointing him governor, with a brief intimation that she meant to intrust that authority to no person till her own arrival in her dominions. "The special cause," says Throckmorton, in writing to the Queen of England, "why she hath changed her opinion for the Lord James, as I hear, is that she could by no means dissuade him from his devotion and good opinion towards your majesty, and the observation of the league between your majesty and the realm of Scotland; and also, that neither she nor the Cardinal Lorraine could win nor divert

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 29th April 1561, Paris.

him from his religion, wherein they used very great means and persuasions. For which respects the said Lord James deserveth to be the more esteemed; and seeing he hath dealt so plainly with the queen his sovereign on your behalf, and shewed himself so constant in religion, that neither the fear of his sovereign's indignation could waver him, nor great promises win him, your majesty may, in my opinion, make good account of his constancy towards you: and so he deserveth to be well entertained and made of, as one that may stand you in no small stead for the advancement of your desire. And in case your majesty would now in time liberally and honourably consider him with some good means, to make him to be the more beholden to you, it would, in my simple judgment, serve your majesty to great purpose."[1]

Moray having left Paris, passed over to Dover, and from thence to the English court. The step taken by the Scottish queen in withholding his promised commission as governor, convinced him that, since their interview, her policy had changed; his measures, therefore, experienced a similar alteration. He was suspected; the queen had resolved to return to her dominions sooner than he had contemplated; and it became necessary for him to provide against it. He knew from Throckmorton, whose sagacity penetrated into the whole system of the French intrigues in Scotland, that a strong Romish party was forming against him; "*love days*"[2] had been made amongst the papists[3] by Mary's advice; Lethington, in a letter to Throckmorton, informed that minister that French gold, which had before this worked so much mischief in the country, might have the same effect again, if England grew lukewarm, and hinted at the necessity of bribing the leading men in Scotland. "I remember," said he, "one old verse of Chaucer, 'With empty hand men should no haukis lure,' *sapienti pauca.*"[4]

Meantime Moray, who remained at the English court, consulted with Elizabeth on the adoption of every method by which Mary might be detained in France: if this failed, and she set out on her journey, it was devised that means should be taken to intercept her on her passage to her dominions.[5] Having acted this disingenuous part, he repaired to Scotland, fully instructed by Cecil in the policy which they thought proper to adopt. He found there Noailles the French ambassador, who, during his absence, had been sent by Mary to communicate her wishes and intention; and soon after his arrival, in the end of May,[6] a convention of the nobility was held, in which the Protestant party carried some violent resolutions against renewing the league with France.[7] At this assembly, Noailles the French ambassador received his audience, and having urged them to break with England, met with a decided refusal. They reminded him of the late cruel war which the French had carried on in Scotland, of the seasonable assistance of Elizabeth, and of the tyranny of the Romish clergy, whom, instead of pastors, they had found to be wolves, thieves, and murderers of the flock. To dissolve a righteous league which had been cemented in the name of God, and to enter again into alliance with those who were the sworn vassals of that papal tyranny, which they had cast off, was, they declared, a proceeding to which they never would give their consent.

With this reply Noailles returned to

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to the Queen, 1st May, 1561, Paris.

[2] "Love days"—days of reconciliation and forgiveness.

[3] Ibid., Throckmorton to Cecil, 21st May, Paris.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, copy, Lethington to Throckmorton, 10th June 1561, Edinburgh.

[5] Copy sent at the time to Elizabeth. State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to the Lord James, 26th June 1561. Camden apud Kennet, vol. i. p. 387. Keith, p. 179.

[6] Neither Keith nor Knox fix the precise date of Moray's arrival at Edinburgh. By a letter of Throckmorton to the Lord James, it appears that he was in London on the 20th May, and at Edinburgh on the 3d June.

[7] Keith, p. 161.

France, and Elizabeth, judging this a proper conjuncture to make a last effort to procure from Mary the ratification of the treaty of Edinburgh, instructed Throckmorton, her ambassador at Paris, to visit her for this purpose. His request was temperately but decidedly denied. The Scottish queen informed him, that she had now finally resolved to return to her dominions in Scotland, where she would have an opportunity of consulting the estates of her realm, without whose advice it would be improper for her to act in this matter; she added that she had resolved to withdraw all Frenchmen from Scotland; that she regretted their presence had given discontent to her subjects and excited jealousy in her good sister; but that nothing should be left undone to satisfy the Queen of England, from whom she expected the like good offices in return. Throckmorton observed in reply, that it seemed superfluous to delay the ratification of the treaty till she had obtained the advice of her nobles and the estates of the realm, of whose opinion there could be no doubt, as the treaty was made by their consent. "Yea," said Mary, "by some of them, but not by all.[1] It will appear when I come amongst them, whether they be of the same mind that you say they were then of. But of this I assure you, Monsieur l'Ambassadeur, I for my part am very desirous to have the perfect and the assured amity of the queen my good sister, and I will use all the means I can to give her occasion to think that I mean it indeed." "I answered," says Throckmorton, "Madam, the queen my mistress, you may be assured, will use the like towards you, to move you to be of the same opinion towards her." "Then," said she, "I trust the queen your mistress will not support nor encourage any of my subjects to continue in their disobedience nor take upon them things which appertaineth not to subjects. You know, (quoth she,) there is much ado in my realm about the matters of religion; and though there be a greater number of a contrary religion to me than I would there were, yet there is no reason that subjects should give a law to their sovereign, and specially in matters of religion, which I fear, (quoth she,) my subjects will take in hand." In reply to this the ambassador adverted to the great changes in religion which had taken place in Scotland, and to the fact that the majority in that kingdom were Protestants. Mary does not appear to have denied this; and, in answer to a remark of Throckmorton, admitted that she had often heard her uncle the cardinal say there was much room for reformation in the discipline of the Church of Rome, but observed, at the same time, that she was none of those who would change their religion every year. "I mean," said she, "to constrain none of my subjects, but would wish that they were all as I am; and I trust they shall have no support to constrain me."[2]

Mary, as we see from this interview, had resolved to visit her dominions; but although she could thus ably reply to so experienced a diplomatist as Throckmorton, it was her peculiar misfortune, that she gave her confidence to those who betrayed it to her adversaries. Amongst these was D'Osell, who enjoyed much credit with her, and had been despatched to solicit a passport from the English queen. He was accompanied by a gentleman,[3] who was to bring it to France, whilst he pursued his journey into Scotland to prepare for his mistress's reception. But D'Osell was altogether unworthy of the trust reposed in him; he communicated to Throckmorton, previous to setting out, the intended movements of the queen, and, on being admitted to an audience, disclosed them to Elizabeth, and advised with her how she ought to proceed. She accordingly refused the passport; with much acrimony and violence gave secret orders for the preparation of some ships of war,

[1] Keith, p. 166.

[2] Keith, p. 167.

[3] Original, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to Cecil, June 30, 1561.

which, under pretence of scouring the seas for pirates, were to watch for the Scottish queen; and, instead of permitting D'Osell to continue his journey to Scotland, sent him back to Paris to inform Mary of her resolution, and secretly to communicate her intentions to Throckmorton.

This ambassador, in a letter to Cecil, expressed surprise and regret at this change of measures. "I do somewhat marvel," said he, "at this resolution on the Queen of Scotland's demand for a passage; and the rather, that by all former writings and messages it seemed to me that her majesty was of the mind to have the said queen enticed to go from hence, and to be advised by the councillors of her own realm, where, as I take it, many occasions of unquietness and practice might be taken away that her being here might work, both by the heads of such as here she is ruled by, and also by the solicitation of such princes as like to entertain, cumber, and be desirous of her: which to do, neither the one nor the other cannot have such commodity if she were in Scotland. I think also upon that you write, that your friends in Scotland will most allow that resolution; whereat I somewhat muse, seeing the Lord James, at his late being here, wrought what he could, and in the same mind hath continued, to persuade the said queen, his sister, to come home; *and if he be now of another mind, I know not what he meaneth.* But if he persist in his former opinion, then it may be feared that you shall offend more than the Queen of Scotland." Throckmorton next alluded to the idea of intercepting Mary. . . . . "Because," said he, "I hear nothing of such as come from thence [England] of any equipage or force by sea in readiness to empesche the Queen of Scotland's passage, or to make that good that Monsieur D'Osell hath reported here her majesty said unto him—which was that her majesty would provide to keep the Queen of Scotland from passing home—I have thought good to say thus much to you, that better it had been if no such thing had been said, but passage granted, if no provision or show be made to empescire her indeed. . . . . And yet I will not advise you to counsel the queen to be at any great cost, inasmuch as the truth and certainty of the queen of Scotland's journey is not known, nor the certain place of her embarking." To this letter this emphatic postscript was added: "If you mind to catch the queen of Scots, your ships must search and see all, for she meaneth rather to steal away than to pass with force."[1]

There is another passage, in a letter from Cecil to the Earl of Sussex, which throws a clear light on this refusal of the passport, and establishes the point that Moray and the Protestant party in Scotland were anxious that she should not be permitted to return to her kingdom. "Monsieur D'Osell," says he, "came from the Scots queen, with the request that the queen his mistress might have a safe conduct to pass along our sea-coasts, and himself to pass into Scotland to provide for her coming. Many reasons moved us to mislike her passage, but this only served us for answer, that where she had promised to send the queen's majesty a good answer for the ratification of the last league of peace, made at Edinburgh, and now had sent none, her majesty would not disguise with her, but plainly would forbear to shew her such pleasure until she should ratify it, and that done, she should not only have free passage, but all helps and gratuities. Monsieur D'Osell was also gently required to return with this answer: what will follow we shall shortly see. *This proceeding will like the Scots well.*"[2]

At this moment the seas were much infested by pirates, and the English queen, who dreaded the expense and the obloquy to which she would be exposed if she openly prepared a fleet to intercept Mary, took advantage of this circumstance to put out to sea

[1] MS. Letter, French Correspondence, State-paper Office, Throckmorton to Cecil, Paris, 26th July 1561.

[2] British Museum, MS. Letter, Cecil to Sussex. Titus, book xiii. 42, dorso. Dated, Newhall, 25th July 1561.

some ships of war, with the avowed object of protecting her merchants, but with secret instructions to be on the watch for the Scottish queen, and not to suffer her to pass.[1]

The refusal of a passport by Elizabeth deeply wounded Mary; but although she dreaded the hostile intentions of that queen, her preparations were now so far advanced, that she determined they should not be countermanded. On the 26th July, she gave a final audience to the English ambassador, and of this interview we have fortunately a minute and interesting account, transmitted by Throckmorton to his royal mistress. It is impossible to read it without forming a favourable idea of the prudence, dignity, and spirit of the young Queen of Scotland. When the ambassador was introduced, she commanded all the audience to retire. "I know not well," said she, "my own infirmity, nor how far I may with my passion be transported, but I like not to have so many witnesses of my passions as the queen your mistress was content to have when she talked with Monsieur D'Osell." She then continued, "There is nothing, Monsieur l'Ambassadeur, doth more grieve me, than that I did so forget myself, as to require of the queen your mistress that favour which I had no need to ask. I needed no more to have made her privy to my journey than she doth me of hers. I may pass well enough home into mine own realm, I think, without her passport or licence; for though the late king your master used all the impeachment he could, both to stay me and catch me when I came hither, yet you know, Monsieur l'Ambassadeur, I came hither safely; and I may have as good means to help me home again as I had to come hither, if I would employ my friends. Truly, I was so far from evil meaning to the queen your mistress, that at this time I was more willing to employ her amity to stand me in stead than all the friends I have; and yet you know, both in this realm and elsewhere, I have both friends and allies, and such as would be glad and willing to employ their forces and aid to stand me in stead. You have oftentimes told me, that the amity between the queen your mistress and me, was very necessary and profitable for us both; and now I have some reason to think, that the queen your mistress is not of that mind; for I am sure, if she were, she would not have refused me thus unkindly. It seemeth she maketh more account of the amity of my disobedient subjects than she doth of me their sovereign, who am her equal in degree though inferior in wisdom and experience, her nighest kinswoman and her next neighbour . . . . Indeed," continued the queen, with great animation, "your mistress doth give me cause to seek friendship where I did not mind to ask it. But Monsieur l'Ambassadeur, let your mistress think that it will be deemed very strange amongst all princes and countries, that she should first animate my subjects against me, and now, being a widow, impeach my going into my own country. I ask of her nothing but friendship; I do not trouble her state, nor practise with her subjects. And yet I know there be in her realm some that be inclined enough to hear offers. I know also they be not of the same mind she is of, neither in religion nor in other things. The queen your mistress doth say that I am young, and do lack experience: but I have age enough and experience to behave myself towards my friends and kinsfolks friendly and uprightly; and I trust my discretion shall not so fail me, that my passion shall move me to use other language of her than is due to a queen and my next kinswoman."

[1] This important fact seems to me to be established by a letter which Cecil addressed to Sussex. "The Scottish queen," says he, "was the 10th of this month at Bulloign, and meaneth to take shipping at Calais. Neither they in Scotland, nor we here, do like her going home. The queen's majesty hath three ships in the North Seas to preserve the fishers from pirates. *I think they will be sorry to see her pass.* MS. Letter, Cecil to Sussex, Smallbridge, Mr Smalldegrave's house, the 12th of August 1561. British Museum, Titus, book xiii. 44, dorso. Keith, p. 178.

Nothing could be more dignified, yet nothing more severe than this remonstrance of Mary; and the manner in which she glanced at the violence into which Elizabeth had been betrayed in her interview with D'Osell, could not fail to touch this proud princess to the quick. Throckmorton, in reply, excused the conduct of the English queen, and fell back upon the old topics of complaint, the assumption of the arms and title of England, and the delay to ratify the treaty of Edinburgh. On both points Mary was prepared to answer him. "You know," said she, "that when I assumed the style and arms of England, I was under the commandment of King Henry my father, and of the king my lord and husband: whatsoever was then done, was their act, not mine; and since their death, I have neither borne the arms nor used the title of England." With regard to the treaty, upon which so much has been said, she contended, that without the advice of the council of her realm, it was impossible she could come to a decision on so grave a matter, which required the mature deliberation of the wisest amongst them. "This," said she, "I cannot have, until I return to my dominions; I am about to haste me home, as fast as I may, to the intent the matters may be answered: and now the queen your mistress will in no wise suffer me neither to pass home, nor him that I sent into my realm, so as, Monsieur l'Ambassadeur, it seemeth the queen your mistress will be the cause why in this matter she is not satisfied, or else she will not be satisfied, but liketh to make this matter a quarrel still betwixt us, whereof she is the author."[1]

On the 21st of July, Throckmorton took leave of Mary, regretting that the terms upon which she then stood with regard to the English queen did not permit him to wait upon her at her embarkation. Her reply was affecting, and seemed almost to shadow forth her future fate. "If," said she, "my preparations were not so much advanced as they are, peradventure the queen your mistress's unkindness might stay my voyage; but now I am determined to adventure the matter, whatsoever come of it. I trust the wind will be so favourable as I shall not need to come on the coast of England; and if I do, then, Monsieur l'Ambassadeur, the queen, your mistress, shall have me in her hands to do her will of me; and if she be so hard-hearted as to desire my end, she may then do her pleasure, and make sacrifice of me: peradventure that casualty might be better for me than to live: in this matter God's will be fulfilled."[2]

These melancholy forebodings were not, however, at this moment destined to be realized. Mary, having left Paris on the 21st of July, was accompanied as far as St Germain by the King of France, the queen-mother, the King of Navarre, and other persons of the first rank. Here, after a few days' stay, she bade adieu to the royal family; and, attended by the Duke of Guise, the Cardinals of Lorraine and Guise, the Grand Prior, who was general of the French galleys, and other noble persons, she proceeded to Calais, where, after waiting some time for a fair wind, she embarked on the 14th of August.[3] All that day she ceased not to direct her eyes toward the shore of France, until her view was intercepted by night. She then commanded a couch to be spread for her on deck, and gave injunctions that she should be awakened at sunrise if the land were still in view. It happened that there was a calm during the night, the ships made little way, and in the morning, the French coast was still discernible.[4] The queen sat up in bed, and straining her eyes till the shore faded from her sight, pathetically bade adieu to the beautiful country where she had passed her happiest years. "Farewell, France," said she, "beloved France, I shall never see thee more!" Soon after this, a favour-

[1] Keith, pp. 174, 175.

[2] Keith, p. 176.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Paris, 19th August 1561, Throckmorton to the Council.

[4] Brantome, vol. ii. p. 326.

able wind sprung up, accompanied by a fog, under cover of which the queen's galleys escaped the English ships, and arrived in the port of Leith on the 19th of August 1561. One vessel, however, in which was the Earl of Eglinton, was captured by Elizabeth's cruisers, and carried into port; but as soon as it was discovered that the young queen was not on board, the prize was released, and pursued her voyage into Scotland. The incident, however, demonstrated clearly the sinister intentions of the English queen.

CHAPTER VI.

MARY.

1561—1565.

On her arrival in her dominions, Mary was received with great joy by all classes of her subjects, and for a while those unhappy feelings which exasperated the various factions of the state against each other, were softened down and forgotten in the general enthusiasm.[1] She was conducted by her nobility with rude state from Leith to her palace of Holyrood. The pomp of the procession, if we may believe Brantome, an eye-witness, was far inferior to the brilliant pageants to which she had been accustomed. She could not repress a sigh when she beheld the sorry palfreys prepared for herself and her ladies; and when awakened on the morning after her arrival, by the citizens singing psalms under her window, the unwonted strains seemed dissonant to courtly ears. But the welcome, though singular, was sincere; the people were delighted with their young queen; her extreme beauty, and the gracefulness of her manners, created a strong prepossession in her favour; her subjects crowded round her with expressions of unfeigned devotedness, and for a time she believed that her forebodings of difficulties and distresses were unfounded.[2]

Within a few days after her return, however, the celebration of mass in her private chapel occasioned a tumult, which was with difficulty appeased. Mary had stipulated for the free exercise of her own form of worship, and the Lord James, previous to his departure for France, maintained, in opposition to Knox and the strictest reformers, that this liberty could not possibly be denied to their sovereign. Here the matter rested till the queen's arrival; but the more intolerant of the Protestants had early made up their minds to resist by force every attempt to raise the "Idol," as they termed the mass, once more in the land. They drew no distinction between the idolatry of the Jews, which was punished by death, and the alleged idolatry of the adherents of the creed of Rome: both were in their eyes maintainers of the accursed thing which was hateful to God. It was even argued by Knox, that the Jews were more tolerable in their tenets than the Romish Church: he would rather see, he said, ten thousand French soldiers landed in Scotland, than suffer a single mass. And when the Master

1 Instructions to Lethington, sent Ambassador to England. Keith, p. 185.

2 Brantome, vol. ii. pp. 123, 124. Mary arrived unexpectedly early in the morning of the 19th August; and the weather was so dark and stormy, that the ships were not seen for the fog. This circumstance must have interrupted the preparations.

of Lindsay, a furious zealot, heard that it was about to be celebrated, he buckled on his harness, assembled his followers, and rushing into the court of the palace, shouted aloud that the priests should die the death. The Lord James, however, opposed this violence, placed himself at the door of the chapel, overawed the multitude, and preserved the lives of the chaplains who officiated, for which he was bitterly and ironically attacked by Knox.[1]

The queen, although she claimed for herself the toleration which she extended to her subjects, was anxious to prevent any misconception of her intentions with regard to religion. It had been declared in council that no alterations should be made, and she now published a proclamation, in which she assured her subjects of her determination to maintain the Protestant form of worship, which she found established at her arrival, and added, that no one should be permitted, under pain of death, to attempt, either publicly or privately, any innovation upon the national faith.[2] Nor was this all: although Knox's sincere, but ill-advised zeal, had done much to excite her opposition, the queen, to the astonishment of her own party, desired to have an interview with the Reformer, who has himself left us an account of their conversation. She blamed him for the violence of his book against female government, and with a clearness and vigour of argument, for which he was probably not prepared, pointed out its evil consequences, in exciting subjects against their rulers. She then advised him to treat with greater charity those who differed from him in opinion. "If, madam," said he, "to rebuke idolatry, and to persuade the people to worship God according to His Word, be to raise subjects against their princes, I cannot stand excused, for so have I acted; but if the true knowledge of God and His right worshipping lead all good subjects (as they assuredly do) to obey the prince from their heart, then who can reprehend me?" As for his book, he allowed it was directed against female government, but excused its principles as being more matters of opinion than of conscience, and professed his willingness to live in all contentment under her majesty's government, as long as she kept her hands undefiled by the blood of the saints of God. He contended, that in religion subjects were bound to follow, not the will of their prince, but the commands of their Creator. "If," said he, "all men in the days of the apostles should have been compelled to follow the religion of the Roman emperors, where would have been the Christian faith? Daniel and his fellows were subjects to Nebuchadnezzar and Darius, and yet they refused to be of their religion."—"But," interrupted the queen, "these men did not resist."—"And yet," replied Knox, "they who obey not the commandment may virtually be said to resist."—"Nay," rejoined Mary, "they did not resist with the sword,"—"That," said Knox, "was simply because they had not the power."—"What," cried the queen, starting and speaking with great energy, "do you maintain that subjects, having power, may resist their princes?"—"Most assuredly," continued the Reformer, "if princes exceed their bounds. God hath nowhere commanded higher reverence to be given to kings by their subjects than to parents by their children; and yet, if a father or mother be struck with madness, and attempt to slay his children, they may lawfully bind and disarm him till the frenzy be overpast. It is even so, madam," continued this stern champion of resistance, fixing his eyes upon the young queen, and raising his voice to a tone which almost amounted to a menace, "it is even so with princes that would murder the children of God, who may be their subjects. Their blind zeal is nothing but a mad frenzy, and therefore, to take the sword from them, to

[1] Knox's History of the Reformation, p. 306.

[2] Knox, p. 307. Corroborated by a Letter of Randolph's to Cecil, 3d June, 1563.—Keith, p. 239.

bind their hands, and to cast them into prison, till they be brought to a more sober mind, is no disobedience against princes, but just obedience, because it agreeth with the Word of God." At these words Mary stood for some time silent and amazed—she was terrified by the violence with which they were uttered. She thought of her own youth and weakness; of the fierce zealots by whom she was surrounded; her mind pictured to itself, in gloomy anticipation, the struggles which awaited her, and she burst into tears. On being comforted and soothed by Moray, who alone was present at the interview, she at length collected herself, and said, turning to Knox, "Well then, I perceive that my subjects shall only obey you, and not me; they must do what they list, not what I command; whilst I must learn to be subject unto them, and not they to me."—"God forbid," said the Reformer, "that it should ever be so; far be it from me to command any, or to absolve subjects from their lawful obedience. My only desire is, that both princes and subjects should obey God, who has in His Word enjoined kings to be nursing fathers, and queens nursing mothers to His Church."—"Yea," quoth Mary, "this is indeed true; but yours is not the Church that I will nourish. I will defend the Church of Rome, for I think it the true Church of God." At this strong assertion of her belief, the indignation of Knox flamed fierce and high. "Your will," said he, "madam, is no reason; neither doth your thought make that Roman harlot to be the immaculate spouse of Christ. And wonder not, madam, that I call Rome an harlot, for that Church is altogether polluted with every kind of spiritual abomination, as well in doctrine as in manners. Yea, madam, I offer myself to prove, that the Church of the Jews who crucified Jesus Christ, when they manifestly denied the Son of God, was not so far degenerated from the ordinances and statutes which God gave by Moses and Aaron unto His people, as the Church of Rome is declined, and for more than five hundred years hath declined, from that purity of religion which the apostles taught and planted." — "My conscience," said Mary, "is not so."—"Conscience," said Knox, "requires knowledge; and I fear of right knowledge you have but little." After some farther exhortations, the Reformer exposed the idolatry of the mass, and threw down his defiance to the most learned Papists in Europe, declaring his earnest wish that he might have an opportunity of engaging with them in controversy before the queen herself. "In that wish," said Mary, "you may, perhaps, be indulged sooner than you expect." She was then called to dinner; and Knox, on taking his leave, prayed that she might be blessed in the commonwealth of Scotland, as richly as ever was Deborah in the commonwealth of Israel.[1]

I have given this interview at some length, and almost in the words of the Reformer, because in the determined and sincere resolution of the queen, that she would support the ancient faith and Church of her fathers, and in the conscientious and violent declaration of Knox, that all such efforts would be met by open resistance, (as far as he had influence,) the causes of the collision which was about to take place are clearly brought out. Alluding to the conferences between Mary and Knox, Lethington, in a letter to Cecil, did justice to the gentleness of the queen, and contrasted it with the harshness of her opponent. "You know," said he, "the vehemency of Mr Knox's spirit, which cannot be bridled, and yet doth sometimes utter such sentences as cannot easily be digested by a weak stomach. I could wish he would deal with her more gently, being a young princess unpersuaded. For this I am accounted too politic; but surely in her comporting with him, she doth declare a wisdom far exceeding her age. God grant her the assistance of His Spirit: surely I see in her a good towardness, and think that the queen your sovereign shall be able to do much with her in religion, if they once enter into a good

[1] Knox, History, p. 311-315, inclusive.

familiarity."[1] That they might enter into this familiarity was now the great object of Mary and her ministers. Elizabeth had congratulated her on her happy return to her dominions, and she soon after (1st September 1561) despatched Lethington, her chief secretary, on a mission to England, to express her earnest wishes for the continuance of peace.[2]

Not long after, she took a triumphant progress from her palace to the castle of Edinburgh. Five black slaves, magnificently apparelled, received her at the west gate of the city;[3] twelve of the chief citizens bore a canopy, under which she rode in state; and a public banquet was given to the queen and the noble strangers by whom she was accompanied. The pageants exhibited on this occasion, marked, indeed, the character of the times. An interlude was performed, in which Korah, Dathan, and Abiram were destroyed as they offered strange fire upon the altar; and it required the interference of Huntly to prevent an indecent parody of the mass, in which the effigy of a priest was to have been burnt as he elevated the host. To the zealous burghers these dramas contained a wholesome signification of God's vengeance against idolaters; to others, as sincere but less fanatical, they appeared unwise incitements to persecution; by those against whom they were directed, although not unnoticed, they were passed over in silence.[4]

It was the anxious desire of the queen to give her kingdom time to recover the effects of the war and anarchy to which it had been so long exposed. She had determined, before leaving France, to make every sacrifice to conciliate Elizabeth; nor was this resolution adopted without a great end in view. Her title to the throne of England was still present to her mind. Her claim to the crown, and her assumption of the arms of this kingdom, had, as we have seen, been injudiciously published by her uncles, when she was still queen of France. Mary had, indeed, apologised for such conduct, and transferred the blame of so strange and premature a measure to her advisers, the Guises; but it was still her earnest desire to have her title to the crown of England recognised by that princess, should she persevere in her vows of celibacy; and, as the surest means to obtain this object, she committed the chief management of her affairs to Moray and Lethington, the great leaders of the Protestant party. Lethington had proposed this scheme to Cecil soon after the death of the French king, and when, anticipating the return of Mary to her dominions, he felt all the peril of his own situation: should he be able to carry this point for the Scottish queen, he knew he was safe; if he failed—if she broke with Elizabeth, and threw herself into the interest of France—he looked upon it as certain ruin. "I made you," says he, in a letter to Cecil, "some overture at London, how to salve all matters. I wrote to you more amply in it from Sir Ralph Sadler's house. I would be glad to understand what you think in it, or how the queen's majesty can like of it, and how it shall be followed. I know the queen my sovereign is so informed against me, that unless I be able to do her some service, I cannot long be suffered to live in her realm; and I will never press to continue in service longer than the amity betwixt both realms shall continue."[5] Lethington was no doubt perfectly sincere in his desire to carry this point in favour of his mistress; and it is remarkable that about six months after he had written to Cecil, and shortly previous to Mary's arrival in Scotland, the Lord James had addressed a letter to the Queen of England on the same delicate subject. In this epistle, which is ably and powerfully written, he congratulated this princess that the ancient enmity between the two nations had been

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 25th October, 1561.

[2] Keith, p. 185. Stevenson's Illustrations of the Reign of Queen Mary, p. 90, Mary to Elizabeth, Sept. 1561.

[3] Keith, p. 189.

[4] Ibid.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 6th Feb. 1560-1.

miraculously converted into reciprocal attachment, and expressed his earnest desire that the members being thus amicably disposed, the heads (meaning Elizabeth and Mary) should be as heartily joined in love. "You are tender cousins," said he, "both queens, in the flower of your ages, much resembling each other in excellent and goodly qualities, on whom God hath bestowed most liberally the gifts of nature and of fortune, whose sex will not permit that you should advance your glory by wars and bloodshed, but that the chief glory of both should stand in a peaceable reign." The only point which had occasioned dissension between them was, he goes on to observe, the premature discussion of his mistress's title. "I wish to God," said he, "my sovereign lady had never, by any advice, taken in head to pretend interest, or claim any title to your majesty's realm, for then I am fully persuadad you should have been and continued as dear friends as you be tender cousins; but now, since on her part something hath been thought of it, and first motioned when the two realms were in war together, your majesty knoweth, I fear, that unless that root may be removed, it shall ever breed unkindness between you. Your majesty cannot yield; and she may on the other part think it hard, being so nigh of the blood of England, so to be made a stranger from it." The Lord James then ventures on the dangerous ground of the succession. "If," says he, "any midway could be picked out to remove this difference to both your contentments, then it is like we should have a perpetual quietness. I have long thought of it, and never durst communicate it to the queen my sovereign, nor many of my countrymen, nor yet will hereafter follow it farther than shall seem good to your majesty. The matter is higher than my capacity is able to compass, yet upon my simple overture your highness can lay a larger foundation. What inconvenience were it, if your majesty's title did remain untouched, as well for yourself as the issue of your body, to provide that to the queen my sovereign her own place were reserved in the succession to the crown of England, which your majesty will pardon me if I take to be next, by the law of all nations, as she that is next in lawful descent of the right line of King Henry the Seventh, your grandfather; and in the meantime this isle to be united in a perpetual friendship? The succession of realms cometh by God's appointment, according to His good pleasure, and no provision of man can alter that which He hath determined, but it must needs come to pass; yet is there appearance, that without injury of any party, this accord might breed us great quietness. Everything must have some beginning. If I may receive answer from your majesty, that you will allow of any such agreement, I will travail with the queen my sovereign, to do what I can to bring her to some conformity. If your majesty dislike it, I will not farther meddle therewith."[1]

This sensible letter its author enclosed to Cecil, directing him to advise on it, and present it, or withdraw it, as he judged best. Whether it ever reached the queen's eye is uncertain; and as the Scottish baron had fearlessly ventured on ground which the more wary Cecil scarcely dared to tread, it is probable he did not risk its delivery; but it proves that the Lord James was sincerely attached on this subject to the interests of his sister the queen. It is worthy of remark, also, that in this grand design, we are furnished with the key to the policy adopted by Mary during the first years of her government. Thus, the same reasons which induced her to favour the Protestants led her to depress the Romanist party, at the head of whom was Huntly, one of the most powerful, crafty, and unscrupulous men in the country, against whom the Lord James placed himself in mortal opposition.[2]

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Edinburgh, 6th August 1561, the Lord James to Queen Elizabeth.

[2] Soon after the queen's arrival, Randolph informed Cecil that Huntly and this potent baron greatly discorded. Some alleged that the cause of the quarrel was a boast of Huntly,

It was not to be expected that the bishops and the Catholic peers should bear this with equanimity,—they had suffered severely in the cause of the queen; they naturally looked to her return as the season when their fidelity was to be rewarded; and their feelings were proportionally bitter when they found themselves treated with neglect, and saw those who had been lately stigmatised as traitors, advanced to the chief offices in the state.[1] They accordingly recommenced their intrigues with the Guises; but these crafty diplomatists would not commit themselves too deeply—it was their present policy to temporise. In an overture to Throckmorton, the English ambassador, the Duke of Guise repeated the proposal of the Lord James, that Elizabeth should declare Mary her successor.[2] It was their object at the same time to procure the renewal of the league with France, and the co-operation of the queen their niece in their vast and unprincipled schemes; and if they failed—if Mary declined their great offers, and refused to "hang her keys at their girdle," they had resolved to form a faction against her, at the head of which should be Chastelherault, Arran, Huntly, and Hume.[3]

Without appearing to notice the plots of the Romanists with France, Mary steadily followed out her design of conciliating the Protestants, and obtaining the friendship of England. She appointed a council of twelve, of whom seven were reformers,[4] and she continued to follow the advice of her brother, the Lord James, on all important subjects, and sent him at the head of a large force, and armed with almost absolute power, to reduce the Borders to obedience.[5] To Randolph, whom Elizabeth appointed her resident at the Scottish court, she behaved with the utmost courtesy; and a correspondence by letters was begun between the princesses, in which all was peace, amity, and playful affection. In his mission to the English court, Lethington urged upon Elizabeth the necessity of declaring Mary her successor. His public instructions, indeed, did not authorise him to enter upon this delicate subject, which has led Keith to question whether it was now broached at all; but we know from Throckmorton's letters, not only that the proposal was made, but that Cecil was much embarrassed by it. "For the matter," says he, "lately proposed to her majesty by the Laird of Ledington, in which to deal one way or other you find difficulties, even so do I think, that not to deal in it at all no manner of way, is more dangerous, as well for the queen's majesty as for the realm, and especially if God should deal so unmercifully with us as to take the queen from us without issue; which God forbid, considering the terms the state standeth in presently."[6] For the moment Elizabeth evaded the point by despatching Sir Peter Mewtas to Scotland, with a request that Mary should confirm the treaty of Edinburgh, a proposal which she well knew the Scottish queen must decline.[7]

Meanwhile, the Lord James exhibited an example of prompt and severe justice upon the Borders. Proceeding to Jedburgh and Dumfries, with an army which rendered opposition useless, he pursued the thieves into their

that if the queen commanded him, he could set up the mass in three shires; to which the other answered that it was past his power to do so, and so he should find the first moment he attempted it. Keith, p. 190.

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 15th Jan. 1561-2. "I thank you for your good advice towards our Papists, which hath been as yet mostly followed; and I trust since the queen's arrival they have obtained no great advantage, but, to be plain with you, be in worse case a great deal than before."

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 8th October 1561.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 13th December 1561. Ibid., same to Cecil, 5th Dec. 1561.

[4] Spottiswood, p. 179.

[5] 8th November 1561. MS. Letter, Lord James to Cecil, State-paper Office.

[6] MS. Letter, French Correspondence, State-paper Office, Throckmorton to Cecil, 9th Oct. 1561.

[7] Treasurer's Accounts, 19th October 1561. Maitland, vol. ii. p. 935.

strongholds, razed their towers to the ground, hanged twenty of the most notorious offenders, sent fifty more in chains to Edinburgh, and in a meeting with the English wardens, Lord Grey and Sir John Forster, restored order and good government to the marches.[1]

During his absence, the Romish clergy resorted to court, but found a colder reception than they anticipated; and although Mons. de Moret, who had been sent from the Duke of Savoy, endeavoured to influence the queen in favour of the Romanists, his power was either very slight,[2] or it suited the tortuous politics of the Guises to encourage at this moment the amity between Mary and Elizabeth. In speaking of an intended interview between the princesses, the proposal of which had come from Mary, Lethington assured Cecil, that France earnestly desired it;[3] and so far did they carry this real or pretended feeling, that it was affirmed by the Lord St Colm, lately arrived from that country, that the Cardinal of Lorraine, in his anxiety to promote the amity between the kingdoms, and to secure to his niece the succession to the English throne, had persuaded her to become a Protestant.[4] To these feelings it is probable we are to ascribe the severe measures against the Roman Catholic clergy, which were adopted at this time in the General Assembly of the Church held in the capital: as the subject is important, it is necessary to treat it with some detail.

Notwithstanding the full establishment of the Reformation, the Protestant ministers were in a state of extreme poverty, and dependent upon the precarious assistance of their flocks; whilst the revenues of the Church were divided between the nobles, who had appropriated them, and the Romish prelates, who still retained part of their ancient wealth. On the meeting of the General Assembly, the ministers determined to use their most strenuous efforts to procure some support out of the ecclesiastical revenues; yet the attempt was resisted by many of the barons who had been zealous supporters of the Reformation, but loved its plunder better than its principles. The rulers of the court began, as Knox says, to draw themselves apart from the society of their brethren, and to fret and grudge.[5] Lethington, learned, acute, and worldly, openly scoffed; and Knox, who dreaded his powers of argument, as much as he suspected his sincerity, attacked him with bitterness. Wood, too, the secretary of the Lord James, the chief adviser of the queen, joined the opponents of the ministers; it was even debated whether the General Assembly, being held without the presence or authority of the queen, was a lawful or constitutional convention. The barons, who had been accustomed to take a part in its proceedings, separated from their brethren; and although, after a violent discussion, they reluctantly concurred in its legality, yet they steadily refused to pass the Book of Discipline, and thwarted, though they did not openly oppose, the measures for the provision of the clergy. After some consultation, however, an act was passed ordaining the annual revenues of the whole benefices in the realm to be calculated, and out of this gross sum, the Catholic clergy consented to give a third to the queen, being permitted to retain two-thirds for themselves. This third was to be applied to the maintenance of preachers, the endowment of schools, the support of the poor, and the increase of the revenue of the crown.[6]

Before this proposal was made, the funds of the Church, previously immense, had been greatly dilapidated. On the overthrow of Popery, the bishops and other dignified clergy had entered into transactions with their friends or kinsmen, by which large portions of ecclesiastical property

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lord James to Cecil, 8th Nov. 1561. Maitland, vol. ii. p. 936; also Randolph to Cecil, 7th Dec. 1561. Keith, p. 205.

[2] Randolph to Cecil, 17th December 1561. Keith, p. 209.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 29th January 1561-2.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 30th January 1561-2.

[5] Knox, p. 318.

[6] Knox, p. 321-324, inclusive.

passed into private hands; in some cases, sales had been made by the ancient incumbents, or leases had been purchased by strangers, which the pope, zealous to protect his persecuted children, had confirmed; the crown, too, had appointed laymen to be factors or administrators of bishoprics and livings: so that, by these various methods, the property of the Church was so much diffused and curtailed, that the third of all the money collected fell far below the sum necessary to give an adequate support to the clergy. There was much fraud also practised in making up the returns. Many of the Catholic clergy evaded the production of their rentals, some gave in false estimates; and although the persons appointed to fix the rate of provision had been the firm supporters of the Reformation, though the Lord James and Maitland of Lethington, with Argyle and Morton, superintended every step, the result disappointed the expectations of the ministers. It was asserted, that the only effect of the change was, to secure a large share for the lay proprietors of church lands, to transfer a considerable portion to the crown, and to leave a wretched pittance to the ministers. Yet, when fairly viewed, the change was certainly creditable to the queen, and involved a concession which ought to have been considered valuable and important. It was a legal recognition of the right of the Presbyterian ministers to be supported by the state, and ought to have convinced all gainsayers that Mary, though she insisted on her private mass, considered the reformed religion as the established faith of the country. This was no little matter, yet no party was pleased. Knox and the ministers were discontented, not only that they received so little, but because in the same assembly the mass was permitted, and the Book of Discipline refused: the Roman Catholic party were still louder in their complaints, and declared, that nothing now was wanting, but an interview between Mary and Elizabeth, to the utter overthrow of the ancient faith. Cecil, whilst he rejoiced that the bishops were spoiled, lamented that their riches should, even in part, have fallen to the crown; and the satirical vein of Randolph ascribed all to the worst motives. "Where your honour," says he, addressing Cecil, "liketh better the diminution of the bishops and other livings, than the augmentation of the crown therewith, what can I better say than that which I find written. 'Merx meritricis, et ad meretrices reversa est.' I find it neither done for zeal to Christ's religion, nor hatred to the viciousness of their lives that had it. If she did it for need, they themselves, to have enjoyed the whole, offered much more; I find not also, that all other men, besides the queen, are pleased with this: the duke beginneth now to grieve—he must depart from seven parts of Arbroath; the Bishop of St Andrews from as much of his livings; the Lord Claud, the Duke's son, in England, future successor to Paisley, also the seventh: the Abbot of Kilwinning, as much, besides divers others of that race; so that many a Hamilton shall shortly be turned a begging. . . . . I know not whether this be able to make the duke a Papist again, for now 'conferunt consilia;' the bishop and he."[1]

Cecil had earnestly advised Lethington to encourage a meeting between the two queens;[2] and although the Scottish secretary felt the danger of negotiating in such a case, observing, that if anything should frame amiss, it would be his utter ruin,[3] the ardent feelings of Mary relieved him of the difficulty, by herself proposing the interview in a letter which she addressed to Elizabeth.[4] France, also, and the cardinal her uncle, encouraged the overture; and even Randolph, whose judgment when in favour with Mary, none can suspect of bias, expressed his opinion of the sincerity, upright dealing, and affection of that prin-

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 15th January 1561-2.
[2] Ibid., 15th January 1561-2.
[3] Ibid.
[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, January 29, 1561-2.

cess.[1] Early in the spring (May 23, 1562) her anxiety upon this subject induced her to despatch Secretary Lethington to the English court, that he might arrange the preliminaries; and the Lord James, her chief minister, who had lately, upon the occasion of his marriage, received from the queen the earldom of Mar, requested leave, when the meeting took place, to bring Christopher Goodman along with him, as the minister of the Protestants, describing him as the most temperate and modest of the learned;[2] and Randolph, in a letter to Elizabeth, alluded in emphatic terms to the anxiety for the interview, expressed by the more wise and moderate amongst the Protestants, and the happy effects they anticipated from it. "The hope," said he, "which they have, that your majesty shall be the instrument to convert their sovereign to Christ, and the knowledge of His true Word, causeth them to wish, above measure, that your majesties may see the one the other."[3]

It is a mortifying but an instructive fact that Knox, and the more violent portion of the reformers, in a conscientious but narrow spirit opposed the meeting with bitterness, and attacked it in the pulpit. They regarded the Prelacy of England as little better than the Popery of Rome, and preferred that their queen should remain an obstinate Papist, rather than take refuge in a religion which had as little ground in the Word of God. "Our Papists," said Randolph, addressing Cecil, "greatly mistrust the meeting; our Protestants as greatly desire it; our preachers, to be plain with your honour, at one word, be more vehement than discreet or learned, which I heartily lament. The little bruit that hath been here of late, that this queen is advised by the cardinal to embrace the religion of England, maketh them now almost wild, of the which they both say and preach, that it is little better than when it was at the worst: I have not so amply conferred with Mr Knox in these matters as shortly I must, who upon Sunday last gave the cross and the candle such a wipe, that as wise and learned as himself wished him to have held his peace. He recompensed the same with a marvellous vehement and piercing prayer, in the end of his sermon, for the continuance of amity and hearty love with England."[4]

In the midst of these negotiations and heartburnings the Earl of Arran, eldest son to the Duke of Chastelherault, went suddenly mad; and in his frenzy accused himself, his father, and the Earl of Bothwell, of a conspiracy to seize the person of the queen, murder the Lord James, (Earl of Mar,) and possess themselves of the government.[5] The violence of this unhappy nobleman, and the deep mortification with which he beheld the chief power intrusted to the Lord James, had already occasioned much disquiet to the queen, and it was reported shortly after her arrival from France, that he meant to attack the palace and carry her off. This disposed people to give some credit to the present conspiracy. It was observed that Arran shewed no symptoms of insanity when he first discovered the enterprise; and the profligate character of Bothwell confirmed their belief. It was he, as Arran insisted, that had invented the whole plot; which, being imparted to him secretly, he agreed to join in the enterprise, and revealed it to his father the Duke, trusting to have him for an accomplice. At first he explained the intention of the conspirators with great clearness, but soon after his disclosures exhibited signs of derangement: he began to talk of

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil. 30th January 1561-2.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 26th May 1562.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Scot's Correspondence, Randolph to the Queen, 26th May 1562.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 12th February 1561-2. It was matter of great regret to the more rigid Protestants in England, that Elizabeth (whose predilection for the ceremonial part of the Romish religion was well known) always kept candles burning on the altar in her private chapel: Knox's attack was against these.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 31st March 1562.

devils and enchantments; affirmed that he had been bewitched by the mother of the Lord James, whom he spoke of as a noted sorceress; retracted much of his former story, and became so incoherent, that, for security rather than punishment, he was committed to ward in the castle.[1]

His alleged accomplices, Bothwell and the Abbot of Kilwinning, were imprisoned, some things appearing suspicious in their conduct; but to the aged duke, who protested his innocence, and with tears bewailed the ruin of his house, Mary behaved with great tenderness: a passage from a letter of Randolph to Elizabeth is important in the picture it gives of her gentleness, justice, and impartiality, upon this trying occasion. The English queen and Cecil, who knew well the violence with which Arran had opposed himself to the queen, imagined that Mary, in her resentment, might be ready to believe anything against him. Randolph, however, completely refutes this unworthy notion. "For the likelihood," says he, "that the queen is not moved with any evil mind towards the duke or his, besides that which I have heard her grace say, I will only declare unto your majesty that which I myself (having many times had suspicion thereof) have observed and marked. I never saw yet, since her grace's arrival, but she sought more means to win the Duke of Chastelherault's good will, and my Lord of Arran's, than ever they had will to acknowledge their duties as subjects unto their sovereign. She knoweth herself in what place God hath appointed them, and that He is the revenger of all injustice. To separate them from her, being her subjects, there is no cause but disobedience and transgression of her laws. She is not ignorant also of the affection of many in this realm towards that house, how many they are, and how they are allied, wherein to attempt anything against them unjustly, or that should not be manifest unto the world what their fault were, it should be her own ruin. These things, an't like your majesty, are no small stays to the appetite of man's will, and much more unto hers, being a woman, lately returned into a country where never yet such obedience hath been given unto the prince or princess as is due unto them. In token also that no such thing was meant of her part, it appeared in nothing more than in the usage of his father, of himself, and their friends, with all gentleness, the more to let them know, and the world judge, that she did love them as her kinsmen, esteemed them as her successors, (if God gave her no issue,) and favoured them as her subjects, if their doings do not merit the contrary. Unto the one, not long since, she promised a reasonable support towards his living, for the time of his father's life; and remitted unto the other many things that, both by law and conscience, he was in danger for both body and goods. After the detection of this crime, the queen's grace so well conceived of my Lord of Arran, and judged so well of his sincere meaning towards her, that she devised with her council what yearly sum, either of money or other thing, she might bestow upon him. What grief this is unto her heart, it hath appeared in many ways, and she hath wished that it could be known unto your majesty, without whose advice, I believe, she will not hastily determine anything against either the one or the other. Of these things," concludes Randolph, "because the whole country doth bear witness, my testimony needeth the less."[2]

Everything, indeed, at this time, in the conduct of the Scottish queen, evinced her sincere attachment to England; and her desire, not only to suppress every intrigue which might disturb the tranquillity of her own kingdom, but where these plots originated, as they sometimes did, with the English Papists, to assist Elizabeth in their detection and punishment.

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 7th April 1562. Same to same 9th April 1562.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Elizabeth, 9th April 1562.

This was clearly shewn at the present moment; for the English queen, having discovered some suspicious intercourse between the Earl of Lennox and the Romish faction, believed it to be a plot for the marriage of the Scottish queen with Lord Darnley; and suddenly committed Lennox and his Countess Lady Margaret, the niece of Henry the Eighth, to the Tower. On being informed of it, Mary approved of the severity, derided the practices of Lennox, and declared her resolution never to unite herself with any of that race.[1] About the same time, the Bishop of St Andrews and the Earl of Eglinton having disobeyed the laws regarding the re-establishment of the mass, a royal proclamation was set forth, denouncing death against all who bore a part in this idolatrous solemnity, or countenanced it by their presence,[2] reserving only the queen's mass in her palace.

To the Lord James her brother, of whose warm attachment to the English interest we have already met with many proofs, the Scottish queen extended so much favour, that his influence became the chief channel to success at court. On his marriage to the daughter of the Earl Marshal, she created him Earl of Mar, and gave a banquet, the splendour of which, with the pageants and masking, called forth the reproof of the more zealous part of the ministers.[3] "At this notable marriage," says Randolph to Cecil, "one thing there was which I must testify with my own hand, which is, that upon Shrove-Tuesday, at night, sitting among the lords at supper in sight of the queen, and placed for that purpose, she drank unto the queen's majesty, and sent me the cup of gold, which weigheth eighteen or twenty ounces. After supper, in giving her majesty thanks, she uttered, in many affectionate words, her desire of amity and perpetual kindness with the queen, and returned and talked long with me thereof, in the hearing of the duke and the Earl of Huntly."[4]

During the absence of Lethington at the English court, the tumults upon the Borders again demanded the prompt interference of the government. Murder, robbery, and offences of all kinds, prevailed to an intolerable degree; and men who had been publicly outlawed, walked abroad, deriding the terrors of justice. Of these crimes, the great centre was Hawick; and the queen, who was determined to make an example, armed the Earl of Mar with full powers against the offenders. Nor was his success less than on his former expedition. Making a sudden and rapid march, he encompassed the town with his soldiers, entered the market-place, and by proclamation forbade any citizen, on pain of death, to receive or shelter a thief. Fifty-three of the most noted outlaws were apprehended, of these eighteen were instantly drowned "for lack of trees and halters." Six were hanged at Edinburgh, and the rest either acquitted or imprisoned in the castle. By this memorable example of severity, the disturbed districts were reduced to sudden and extraordinary quietness, whilst the courage and success of Mar contributed to raise him still higher than before in the favour of his sovereign.[5]

Mary had already declined many royal offers of marriage, and aware that any alliance which she made must be an object of deep and jealous interest to Elizabeth, she was anxious to have the approval and advice of that princess. It was this feeling, probably, which induced her to receive with caution, though with her accustomed courtesy, the ambassador of the king of Sweden, who, about this time (June 3, 1562) arrived on a matrimonial mission in Scotland. He brought with him a whole-length portrait of his master, which he delivered to one of the Marys,[6] to be

1 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 31st March 1562.
2 Ibid., 3d June 1562.
3 Knox, p. 327.
4 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 12th February, 1561-2.
5 Ibid., 8th July 1562.
6 See supra, p. 68.

presented to the queen, who hung it up in her private cabinet, and dismissed him with letters and a safe-conduct for the Swedish monarch and his navy to land within any port of her realm which they might find most convenient.[1] This prince had already made proposals to Elizabeth, which were coldly received; but Mary was aware of the jealousy of her nature, and the danger of appearing to interfere with her admirers, and she now looked anxiously for the return of Lethington.

At length this minister arrived with the welcome intelligence that the English queen had consented to the interview. She sent her picture, with many expressions of affection to the queen, and zeal for the continued amity between the kingdoms. Mary instantly commenced preparations for her journey. "This present day," says Randolph, "she hath directed her letters again to all the noblemen of her realm, to be with all convenient speed with her at Edinburgh, and for this cause departeth herself hitherward to-morrow, as the most convenient place to take resolution in all things she hath to do. It pleased her grace immediately after she had conferred with the Lord of Lethington, and had received my sovereign's picture, to send for me. After she had rehearsed many such purposes, as by the Lord of Lethington's report unto her grace had been spoken of her by my sovereign, touching her sisterly affection towards her, her good will and earnest desire to continue in peace and amity, and, in special, that they might see each other, she sheweth unto me my said sovereign's picture, and asketh me how like that was unto her lively face? I answered unto her, that I trusted that her grace should shortly be judge thereof herself, and find much more perfection than could be set forth by the art of man."—"That," saith she, "is the thing that I have most desired, ever since I was in hope thereof, and she shall well assure herself there shall be no stay in me, though it were to take any pains, or to do more than I may well say; and I trust by that time that we have spoken together, our hearts will be so eased, that the greatest grief that ever after shall be between us, will be when we shall take leave the one of the other. And let God be my witness, I honour her in my heart, and love her as my dear and natural sister. Let me be believed of you, that I do not feign. . . . . Since, therefore," concludes Randolph, "the princesses' hearts are so wedded together, as divers ways it is manifest that they are; seeing the purpose is so godly, without other respects but to live in love, I doubt not but, how much soever the world rage thereat, the greater will be the glory unto them both, and the success of the enterprise the happier. To resolve, therefore, with your honour herein, I find in this queen so much good will as can be possible; in many of her subjects no less desire than in herself; the rest not such that any such account is to be made of, that either they can hinder the purpose, or do great good, whatsomever they become."[2]

All things being thus in readiness for the interview, and Mary looking forward to it with the ardent and sanguine feelings which belonged to her character, an unexpected obstacle arose from the quarter of France. In that country, the religious and political struggle between the Catholic party and the Protestants suddenly assumed a more fierce and sanguinary aspect; and the Queen of England, who steadily supported Coligni and the Protestants, resolved to remain for the whole summer at home, to watch the proceedings of the league which France, Spain, Savoy, and Rome, had organized against the common cause of the Reformation. It may, indeed, be doubted, whether Elizabeth was ever sincere in her wish to have a meeting with Mary. It is at least certain that she readily seized this cause of delay; and in July de-

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 3d June 1562.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 15th July 1562.

spatched Sir Henry Sidney into Scotland to defer the interview of the two queens till the ensuing summer. Mary received Sidney with expressions of unfeigned disappointment and sorrow. She listened to his embassy, as he himself reports, "with watery eyes;" and Mar and Lethington assured him, that had she not already found a vent for her passionate grief in her private chamber, the expression of it would have been still more violent.[1] It is evident that her heart was intent upon this object, and the delay may have caused a painful suspicion of the sincerity of the English queen, for whose sake she had already made no inconsiderable sacrifices. Yet the message of Elizabeth was warm and cordial. She assured Mary, that to have seen her dear sister that summer was her earnest desire; that she now delayed the meeting with the utmost reluctance, and had so fully determined to enjoy her company in the spring, that she had sent by Sidney her confirmation of the treaty for the interview, leaving it to her to fix upon any days between the 20th of May and the last of August.[2] Mary was reassured, and would instantly have accepted the treaty and named the day of meeting; but most of her council being absent, Lethington thought it prudent to delay, and promised within a month to send her final resolution.[3]

The queen, relieved from this anxiety, now resolved to visit the northern parts of her dominions; and, following her own inclination rather than the advice of her council,[4] made preparations for her progress as far as Inverness; but before she set out, a Jesuit arrived in Scotland with a secret message from the pope. So violent at this time was the feeling of the common people against any intercourse with Rome, that Mary did not dare to receive him openly; but whilst the Protestant nobles were at the sermon, Lethington conveyed him by stealth into the queen's closet. The preacher, however, was more brief than usual in his discourse, and the Earl of Mar, coming suddenly into the antechamber, had nearly discovered the interview; so that the papal envoy was smuggled away by the Marys with much speed and alarm, yet not before Randolph had caught a glimpse of "a strange visage," which filled him full of suspicion. "The effect of his legation," says this ambassador, "was to know whether she could send unto the General Council, (he means the Council of Trent, then sitting;) and he was directed to use his influence to keep her steadfast in her religion; so at least the secretary assured him; but he believed there was more under this commission than he or Lethington was permitted to see.[5] The messenger, who was a bishop, narrowly escaped; for no sooner was it known that a papal emissary had dared to set his foot in Scotland, than his death was resolved on; and nothing saved him but the peremptory remonstrance of Mar.[6]

Mary now set out on her progress northward, accompanied by most of her principal nobles. At Aberdeen she was met by the Earl of Huntly, the head of the Romish party and the great rival of Mar. This nobleman was nearly allied to the Duke of Chastelherault, by the marriage of his eldest son, Lord Gordon, to the daughter of Hamilton; and both Huntly and the duke, although separated by difference of religious faith, were jealous of the power of Mar, and enemies to the strict amity with England. Huntly, indeed, had felt keenly the neglect and want of confidence with which he had been treated by the queen. She had received with coldness the advances made by him and his party immediately after the death of her husband; his offer to re-establish the ancient religion on her arrival in her dominions had been repelled;

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Sidney to Cecil, 25th July 1562, Edinburgh.

[2] Instructions to Sir H. Sidney. Haynes, p. 392.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 29th July 1562.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 10th August 1562.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 1st August 1562.

[6] Ibid.

although he held the high office of chancellor, and sat in the privy-council, his influence was merely nominal; and, which cut deeper than all, he discovered that Mar intended to possess himself of the earldom of Moray, an extensive and opulent appanage, of which he, for some years back, had enjoyed the revenues and wielded the power. Shortly before this, one of his sons, Sir John Gordon, having a private feud with Lord Ogilvy, had attacked and desperately wounded this nobleman in the streets of the capital. The assailant being seized and imprisoned, broke from his confinement and fled to his estates. Mary was exasperated; but the eloquence of the countess his mother assuaged her resentment, and brought her son to reason. The offender appeared before his sovereign, and was ordered to ward in the castle of Stirling. When on his road thither, he again repented of his submission, escaped from his guards, and gathering a thousand horsemen, bade defiance to the royal power. Such was the state of things when Huntly heard of the queen's resolution to visit his country, accompanied by Mar and her principal nobility. He had long envied the influence of that earl with the queen; and being strong in friends, and possessed of almost sovereign authority in those northern districts, he seems to have had the temerity to believe that the moment had arrived when a revolution might be accomplished, which would rid him of his rival, and place in his hands the chief power of the government. But Mary suspected his practices and dreaded his ambition. On being pressed by him to visit his house at Strathbogie, of which the magnificence rivalled her own palaces, she declined paying that honour to the father of a rebel; and pushing forward to the castle of Inverness, where it was her intention to remain for some time, she found its gates insolently shut against her. On the place being summoned, it was answered by the captain, a retainer of Huntly's, that without the orders of Lord Gordon, for whom he held it, the castle should not be given up. This was open rebellion; and Mary, having raised the force of the country, prepared to carry the place by assault. On this occasion the queen evinced something of the warlike spirit of her ancestors. Instead of lamenting that she had engaged in a journey so full of peril, "she repented she was not a man, to know what life it was to lie all night in the fields, or walk the rounds with a jack and knapscull."[1] Her military aspirations, however, were not gratified by an actual siege: the captain, having surrendered, was hanged; and Mary, although informed that Huntly watched to intercept her in the woods on the banks of the Spey, advanced against him, crossed the river without seeing an enemy, and returned at the head of three thousand men to Aberdeen. There was a romance and danger about the expedition which pleased the queen, and awakened some knightly enthusiasm in Randolph, the English envoy, who accompanied her. "What desperate blows," says he, in his letter to Cecil, "would that day have been given—when every man should have fought in sight of so noble a queen, and so many fair ladies, our enemies to have taken them from us, and we to save our honours and not to be bereft of them—your honour may easily imagine."[2]

Huntly seems to have overrated his strength, but it was now too late to recede; and his animosity was stimulated to the highest pitch, by Mary rewarding Mar, on her return to Aberdeen, with the prize he had long coveted, the earldom of Moray. He persuaded himself that nothing short of his ruin was contemplated; and having made a last and ineffectual attempt to mollify the royal resentment, he fortified his castles of Findlater, Achendown, and Strathbogie, assembled his vassals, and pushed rapidly to Aberdeen, in the hope of seizing the queen. But the result was disastrous; as he marched forward,

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 18th September 1562.
[2] Ibid., 24th September 1562.

his force melted away, and with scarce five hundred men, he found himself attacked by the Earls of Moray, Morton, and Athole, at the head of two thousand men. The position where he made his last stand, was a hill named Corrichie, about twelve miles from the city. From this, being driven by the fire of the arquebuses into a low marshy level, he was set upon by the spearmen of Moray, and completely defeated; himself slain, whether by the sword or suffocation, from the weight of his armour, was uncertain; his two sons made prisoners, and the rest of his company either killed, dispersed, or taken.[1]

Sir John Gordon, the second son, who was reported to have been the chief contriver of this rebellion, and whose ambition aspired to the hand of the queen, was immediately executed; and the body of Huntly, according to a savage feudal practice, after having been embowelled, was kept unburied till parliament should pronounce upon it the sentence of treason, (2d November 1562.) His third son, Adam Gordon, a youth of eighteen, received a pardon; but the eldest, Lord Gordon, was found guilty of treason and imprisoned;—the immense estates of the family were seized by the crown, the title forfeited, and this all-potent house reduced in a moment to insignificance and beggary.

Some authors, guided by their prejudices rather than their research, have imagined that the fate of this great baron may be traced to a premeditated conspiracy of Moray, who carried the queen north, and prevailed on her to provoke Huntly into rebellion by her suspicions and neglect. This is mere conjecture: it is certain that the northern progress was planned by the queen herself, and that her council, of whom Moray was the chief, so far from exciting Mary against Huntly, urged her to visit him at Strathbogie.[2] Sir John Gordon confessed his treasonable designs, and laid the burden of them on his father; two confidential servants of Huntly's, Thomas Ker and his brother, acknowledged that their master, on three several occasions, had plotted to cut off Moray and Lethington; and the queen herself, in a conversation with Randolph, thanked God for having delivered her enemy into her hand. "She declared," says this minister, who was an eye-witness and companion of the northern progress, "many a shameful and detestable part that he thought to have used against her, as to have married her where he would, to have slain her brother, and whom other he liked; the places, the times, where it should have been done; and how easy a matter it was, if God had not preserved her."[3] It was natural that Moray should rejoice in the fall of so potent an enemy to the Protestant party as Huntly. It is true that he availed himself of his offences to strengthen his own power; but that, prior to the rebellion, he had laid a base design to entrap him into treason, is an opinion founded on conjecture, and contradicted by fact.

Mary now returned to her capital[4] and devoted herself to the cares of government; but the difficulties of her situation increased. War had begun (to use the words of Secretary Maitland) between the two countries of the earth which, next to her own, were most dear to her,[5] France and England — being descended of the blood of both of them by her father, and one of them by her mother. France was ready to urge her by the love she bore her relatives there, by the recollections of her early education in that country, and by the ties of a common faith, not to desert her friends, when her assistance might be of essential benefit. Elizabeth, on the other hand, explained by her ambas-

1 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 2d November 1562. Also, same to same, 2d November 1562.

2 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, 10th August 1562. Ibid., same to same, 31st August 1562.

3 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 23d October 1562. Ibid., same to same, 28th October 1562. Ibid., same to same, 2d November 1562.

4 21st November 1562.

5 Keith, p. 232.

sador, the causes which compelled her to send an army into France. The French king's subjects in Normandy had urged her, she said, to relieve them from the unjust tyranny of the house of Guise; and as that monarch was unable to give them assistance, she had entered into a treaty with the Prince of Condé, by which it was agreed he should receive support both in forces and money.[1]

When Randolph communicated this information to Mary, she did not dissemble her sorrow, nor conceal her affection for her uncles. "This," said she, "I must say in their defence—I believe them to be true subjects to their prince, and that they do no more than execute his orders; but," she added, "that she was not so unreasonable as to condemn those who differed from her in opinion, still less was she inclined, on their account, to abate anything of the friendship she felt for his mistress the Queen of England (2d November 1562.) It was, in truth, scarcely possible for Elizabeth to entertain at this moment any serious fears of Mary's intrigues in France, when we find Randolph assuring Cecil, that she heard almost as seldom from that country as the King of Muscovy.[2]

Everything, indeed, seemed to favour the growing strength of the party of the Congregation in Scotland: the fall of Huntly, the amity with England, the queen's partiality to Moray, the decided favour shewn to the Protestants, and the gentleness with which she pleaded for her uncles, all evinced a determination in the queen not to allow her personal convictions on the subject of religion to interfere with her duties as a sovereign. It was only to be regretted, that the conduct of Knox, and the more violent of his brethren, occasionally excited feelings of resentment, when there was a predisposition to peace; and that his endeavours to secure the triumph of his party, (conscientious as they undoubtedly were,) were seldom accompanied by sound discretion or Christian love. Even Randolph, their partial friend, was shocked by the manner in which the preachers prayed for the queen. "They pray," says he, in his letter to Cecil, "that God will keep us from the bondage of strangers; and for herself, as much in effect as, that God will either turn her heart or send her short life." He added, ironically, "Of what charity or spirit this proceedeth, I leave to be discussed by the great divines."[3] Although the queen, as we learn from Lethington's letters, behaved towards the Reformer with much forbearance, it seems to have created no impression in her favour. As long as she retained her own faith, and permitted the celebration of mass in her private chapel, nothing could disarm his suspicions, appease his wrath, or check the personality of his attacks. His natural disposition was sarcastic, he had a strong sense of the ludicrous, and when provoked, his invectives were so minute, coarse, and humorous, that they alternately excited ridicule or indignation. Lethington scoffed, Morton commanded him to hold his peace, and Randolph, as we have seen, regretted that his proceedings had more zeal than charity.

News having arrived about this time of the restoration of peace to France, the queen, who took a deep interest in her uncles, was disposed to be merry; and the court, reflecting the countenance of the prince, was much occupied in masques and dancing; but to the news of peace were added suspicions of an intended persecution of the Protestants by the Guises; and Knox, grieving for his brethren, and scandalized at the prevailing gaieties, fulminated a complaint in the pulpit against the ignorance, tyranny, and malevolence of princes. His words were meant chiefly to apply to the Guises; but he was reported to have spoken irreverently of his sovereign, and brought before her to answer for his attack. His defence, which he has himself pre-

[1] MS. State-paper Office, Sir J. Williamson's Collection, 2d series, vol. ii. pp. 169, 179.

[2] State-paper Office, MS. Letter, Randolph to Cecil, 30th Dec. 1562.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 28th Feb. 1562-3.

served in his history, was calculated rather to aggravate than extenuate the provocation. "Madam," said he, "this is oftentimes the just recompense which God gives the stubborn of the world, that because they will not hear God speaking to the comfort of the penitent, and for amendment of the wicked, they are oft compelled to hear the false report of others, to their great displeasure. I doubt not that it came to the ears of Herod, that our Master Jesus Christ called him a fox; but they told him not how odious a thing it was before God to murder an innocent, as he had lately done before, causing to behead John the Baptist, to reward the dancing of a harlot's daughter. If the reporters of my words had been honest men, they would have repeated my words, and the circumstances of the same; but because they would have credit in court, and wanting virtue worthy thereof, they needs must have somewhat to pleasure your majesty, if it were but flatteries and lies; but such pleasure, if any your majesty take in such persons, will turn to your everlasting displeasure; for, madam, if your own ears had heard the whole matter that I treated, if there be in you any spark of the spirit of God, yea, of honesty and wisdom, you would not justly have been offended with anything that I spake. And because you have heard their report, please your majesty to hear myself rehearse the same, so near as memory will serve [it was even next day after that the sermon was made.] My text, madam, was this: 'And now, oh, kings, understand; be learned, ye judges of the earth.' After I had declared the dignity of kings and rulers, the honour wherein God has placed them, the obedience that is due unto them, being God's lieutenants, I demanded this question: But oh, alas, what account shall the most part of princes make before that supreme Judge, whose throne and authority so manifestly and shamefully they abuse? The complaint of Solomon is this day most true, that violence and oppression do occupy the throne of God here on this earth, for whilst that murderers, bloodthirsty men, oppressors, and malefactors dare be bold to present themselves before kings and princes, and that the poor saints of God are banished and exiled, what shall we say, but that the devil hath taken possession in the throne of God, which ought to be a dread to all wicked doers, and a refuge to the innocent and oppressed? And how can it be otherwise, for princes will not understand, they will not be learned as God commands them; but they despise God's law; His statutes and holy ordinances they will not understand? For in fiddling and flinging they are more exercised, than in reading or hearing God's most blessed word; and fiddlers and flatterers (which commonly corrupt youth) are more precious in their eyes than men of wisdom and gravity, who by wholesome admonitions may beat down in them some part of that vanity and pride wherein we are all born, but which in princes takes deep root and strength by evil education. And of dancing, madam, I said, that albeit in Scripture I found no praise of it, and in profane writers, that it is termed the gesture rather of those that are mad and in frenzy than of sober men; yet I do not utterly condemn it, provided that two vices be avoided: the former, that the principal vocation of those that use that exercise be not neglected for the pleasure of dancing; secondly, that they dance not as the Philistines, their fathers, for the pleasure that they take in the displeasure of God's people; for if they do these, or either of them, they shall receive the reward of dancers, and that will be to drink in hell, unless they repent."

—"Your words are sharp enough even now," said Mary; "and yet they were told me in another manner. I know that you and my uncles are not of one religion, and, therefore, I cannot blame you for conceiving so ill an opinion of them; but for myself, if you disapprove of aught, come to myself, speak openly, and I shall hear you." "Madam," answered Knox, "I am assured that your uncles are enemies to God, and unto His Son

Jesus Christ, and for the maintenance of their own pomp and worldly glory, that they spare not to spill the blood of many innocents: and, therefore, I am assured, their enterprises shall have no better success than others have had, who before them have done as they do now.[1]

A melancholy incident soon after occurred, which in some measure justified Knox in his censure of the licentious manners of the court. Mary, who was passionately fond of music, had shewn much favour to Chartellet, a French gentleman of good family, highly skilled in that science, and in other respects a handsome and accomplished person. Such encouragement[2] from a beautiful woman, and a queen, turned the unfortunate man's head; he aspired to her love, and, in a fit of amorous frenzy, hid himself in the royal bed-chamber, where, some minutes before she entered it, he was discovered by her female attendants. The circumstance was not disclosed to the queen till the succeeding morning, when, with an ill-judged lenity, she contented herself with commanding him to leave the court. Desperate in his attachment, however, he secretly followed her to Burntisland, and at night, when the queen was stepping into bed, and none beside her but her ladies, Chartellet again started from a recess, where he had concealed himself. The shrieks of the women soon roused the court, and when seized by those who rushed in, on hearing the uproar in the royal apartment, he audaciously acknowledged that he had meditated an attempt on the honour of the queen. Mary, glowing with indignation at the insult, commanded Moray, who first ran to her succour, to stab him with his dagger; but he preferred securing him to this summary vengeance: a formal trial followed, and the miserable man was condemned and executed within two days after his offence.[3] On the scaffold, instead of having recourse to his missal or breviary, he drew from his pocket a volume of Ronsard, and reading the poet's Hymn to Death, resigned himself to his fate with gaiety and indifference.[4] It was a lamentable spectacle: men blamed, but at the same time pitied him; they had not forgotten the recent flight of Captain Hepburn, who had behaved with brutal indelicacy to Mary; it seemed strange that, within a short time, two such outrageous insults should have been offered, and some did not scruple to blame the indiscriminate condescension of the queen, whose love of admiration made her sometimes forget the dignity and reserve which are so sure a protection of female purity.

Shortly after this, the Scottish queen became disturbed by a rumour, that some measures, prejudicial to her right of succession, were contemplated in the English parliament, and she despatched Lethington to England, that he might watch over her interests (12th February 1562–3.)[5] He was enjoined not only to attend to the affair of the succession, but to endeavour to promote a reconciliation between Elizabeth and the party of the Guises; and, after he had concluded his transactions, to pass over to France with the same object. The secretary undertook the mission with reluctance;[6] yet, with his usual ability, he succeeded in accomplishing the most important of his objects. No discussion of Mary's title took place; and the

[1] Knox, pp. 334, 335. The time of this conversation between the Reformer and the queen is fixed by a passage in a MS. Letter from Randolph to Cecil, dated 16th December 1562, State-paper Office. "Upon Sunday last, he [Knox] inveighed sore against the queen's dancing, and little exercise of herself in virtue and godliness. The report hereof being brought unto her ears, *yesterday*, she sent for him. She talked long time with him; little liking there was between them, of the one or the other, yet did they so depart as no offence or slander did rise thereon."

[2] Keith, p. 231.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 28th February 1562-3.

[4] Brantome, vol. ii. p. 332. Randolph says, he died with repentance.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Moray to Cecil, 12th February 1562–3. Keith, p. 235, complains that the date of Maitland's Mission is *irrecoverably* lost. It is *fixed* by the above letter.

[6] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 6th Feb. 1562-3.

good understanding between the two queens continued, apparently at least, as firm as before.

It was beyond his power, however, to heal the wounds of France; and although Mary, in pathetic and earnest terms, offered herself as a mediatrix between her good sister Elizabeth and that country, the recent course of events there had assumed an aspect which precluded all hopes of success, and were viewed by her with the deepest emotions. A zealous Catholic, and warmly attached to her uncles, she watched with interest the progress of events, and rejoiced in the successes which, at Bruges, Rouen, and Dreux, attended the arms of the Duke of Guise; but she was shocked with the ferocious character which the war had assumed. It was melancholy to see the country which was so dear to her, the land of her infancy, where she had passed her happiest years, flooded with the blood of its citizens; its towns stormed and razed, and its brave nobility opposed in mortal strife to each other; even the news of their successes raised such conflicting feelings, that she heard them with tears;[1] and on receiving accounts of the assassination of the Duke of Guise, her grief was poignant;[2] yet she continued to make every effort for the restoration of concord in that country, and the preservation of amity with England. The insincerity and caprice of Elizabeth; the intrigues of Randolph, who secretly encouraged Scottish volunteers to assist the Huguenots;[3] the violence and suspicion of Knox, which even Randolph pronounced unreasonable;[4] and the intrigues of Cecil, could not deter her from that upright policy, which persuaded her that many sacrifices should be made rather than break with England. She was cast down, indeed, when she beheld the increasing difficulties which were gathering around her; and the letters of the English minister present us with many painful pictures of her grief and embarrassment. Yet, when Cecil was disposed to doubt her sincerity, the same acute observer derides the vain fears of this statesman, and bears testimony to the friendly disposition of the queen, her councillors, and her people, towards England.

The two great objects which now filled Mary's mind, and employed the earnest deliberations of her ministers, were her right of succession to the English throne, and her marriage. On both points she was anxious, as indeed it was her interest, to consult the wishes of Elizabeth.[4] She had now remained in a widowed state for three years: she was convinced that a speedy marriage was the best measure for herself and her kingdom; her opinion was fortified by that of Moray and Lethington, and her hand had been already sought by the king of Sweden, the Infant of Spain, and the Archduke Charles, second son of the emperor; yet Elizabeth, although ever ready to oppose every foreign match, continued to preserve much mystery in stating her own wishes on the subject. It was evident it could not long suit the dignity of an independent princess to listen to ingenious objections, and repress every royal suitor in submission to the wishes of a sister queen. About this time a report having reached the English court, that the successful candidate was one of the emperor's lineage, Cecil wrote in much alarm to Moray, who replied with firmness and good sense, that nothing serious had been yet concluded. But he added, that neither was it for her honour, nor could he advise her, to repress the suit of princes, however deeply interested in the continuance of the friendship between the two queens, and the mutual love and quietness of their subjects.[6]

Mary's difficulties, however, arose not merely from the interference and jealousy of the English queen, and the

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 5th January 1562-3.
[2] Ibid, 18th March 1562-3.
[3] Ibid, 10th March 1562-3.
[4] Ibid, 16th December 1562.
[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 15th May 1563.—Keith, p. 239, printed in Robertson's Appendix, No. vii.
[6] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Earl of Moray to Cecil, 23d September 1563.

mysterious diplomacy of Cecil: the violence of the party which was headed by Knox and the reformed preachers occasioned her infinite disquiet, and was at length carried to such a height as to occasion a schism amongst the Protestants themselves. We have seen that this party disapproved entirely of the lenity with which Mary had been permitted the private exercise of her religion. The laxity with which the enactments against the mass were carried into execution excited their constant suspicion, and they persuaded themselves it was in vain to look for the favour of God till Presbyterianism, in its most rigid form, was established throughout the country. In this view, some whispers which began to float about regarding the marriage of Mary to a noble person recommended by Elizabeth, and, as a basis of this union, the restoration of complete amity between the two queens, gave them no little alarm. They knew the aversion of the English queen, as well as of Mary, to the form of worship which they believed the only system founded on Scripture; and it was really more tolerable for them to see their royal mistress a confirmed Papist and the enemy of England, than the friend and (as had been anticipated more than once by Randolph and Lethington) convert of Elizabeth to the Church of England.

To excite suspicions and interrupt the good understanding between the two queens became, therefore, a favourite object with Knox and the more violent of the reformers. They did not hesitate to blame Moray and Lethington for their anxiety to accomplish an interview, and traversed their praiseworthy efforts, by representing all the friendship professed by Mary as hollow and insidious. And yet, even from Knox himself, we learn some facts which might have convinced him of the contrary.

During the absence of Lethington in England, the Papists, encouraged by the Bishop of St Andrews and the Prior of Whithern, had disregarded the queen's proclamation. Mass was celebrated secretly in many private houses; and, when this was found dangerous, the votaries of the Romish faith fled into the woods and mountains, where, amidst their silent solitudes, they adhered to the worship of their fathers.[1] Upon this the Presbyterians, despairing, as they alleged, of any redress of such abuse from the queen, took the law into their own hands, pursued and seized some priests, and sent word to the Romish clergy, that henceforth they would neither complain to the queen nor council, but, with their own hands, execute upon idolaters the punishment contained in God's Word.[2] Mary, justly alarmed at this, sent for Knox to Lochleven, where she then resided, and remonstrated in earnest terms. She recommended toleration, and argued with him upon the cruelty of religious persecution. The Reformer pleaded the laws in force against idolatry; these, he said, it was the duty of princes to execute; if they failed so to do, others must do it for them; nor would God be offended if men, who feared Him, albeit neither kings nor magistrates, took it upon them to inflict judgment. "Samuel," said he, "spared not to slay Agag the fat and delicate king of Amalek, whom Saul had saved; nor did Elias spare Jezebel's prophets and Baal's priests, although King Ahab stood by. Phinehas was no magistrate, but he feared not to strike Zimri and Cozbi." These examples proved, he contended, that subjects might lawfully punish, although they were not clothed with the authority of the magistrate. But he besought the queen not to compel any one to this last resource, but herself administer the laws. "Think, madam," he concluded, "think of the mutual contract, and the mutual duties between yourself and your subjects. They are bound to obey you: ye are bound to keep the laws unto them. You crave of them service: they demand of you protection and defence against wicked doers."[3]

[1] Randolph to Cecil, 1st May 1563.—Keith, 239.

[2] Knox, p. 352.

[3] Ibid. p. 353.

This bold exposition produced a favourable effect. Mary, for the moment, seemed offended, but soon after she sent for Knox, who met her next day as she pursued her pastime of hawking. Their interview was amicable—almost confidential. The queen, alluding to the intended election of a superintendent for Dumfries and the adjacent country, warned the Reformer against the Bishop of Caithness, who was a candidate for that preferment; and she informed him with great frankness, that his reasoning of yesterday had convinced her—that the offenders should be summoned, and justice duly administered.[1]

Nor was this promise forgotten. On the 19th of May, a few days before the meeting of parliament, the Archbishop of St Andrews, the Prior of Whithern, the Parson of Sanquhar, and other Papists, were arraigned before Argyle the Justice-general, for the crime of celebrating mass; and, having pleaded guilty, were subjected to a temporary imprisonment.[2]

The parliament now met, and was held with unusual pomp. Mary, surrounded by a brilliant cavalcade, rode in procession to the Tolbooth, where the estates assembled; the hall was crowded, not only by the members, but glittered with the splendid dresses of the royal household and the ladies of the court, who surrounded the throne and filled the galleries. The extreme beauty of the queen, and the grace with which she delivered the address in which she opened the proceedings, surprised and delighted her people: many exclaimed, "May God save that sweet face! she speaks as properly as the best orator among them!"[3]

Amidst this general enthusiasm, the preachers took great offence at the liberty of the French manners, and the extravagance of the foreign dresses. "They spake boldly," says Knox, "against the superfluities of their clothes, and affirmed, that the vengeance of God would fall, not only on the foolish women, but on the whole realm." To check the growing licentiousness, an attempt was made to introduce a sumptuary law; articles against apparel were drawn up, and it was proposed to take order with other abuses; but, to the extreme mortification of the Reformer, he was arrested in his career of legislation by the hand of the Lord James. This powerful minister deemed it impolitic at this moment to introduce these enactments. "The queen," he said, "had kept her promises, the religion was established, the mass-mongers were punished: if they carried things too high, she would hold no parliament at all." Knox smiled significantly—Mar, he hinted, trembled for his new earldom of Moray, and all must be postponed to have his grant confirmed, lest Mary should repent of her munificence; he denounced, in strong terms, such selfish motives, reminded him of his solemn engagements to the Church, and accused him of sacrificing truth to convenience, and the service of his God to the interests of his ambition. The proud spirit of Moray could not brook such an attack, and he replied with asperity; the two friends parted in anger, and the Reformer increased the estrangement by addressing a letter in which, in his usual plain and vehement style of reproof, he exonerated himself of all further care in his lordship's affairs, committing him to the guidance of his own understanding, whose dictates he preferred to the advancement of the truth. "I praise my God," said he, "I leave you victor over your enemies, promoted to great honour, and in authority with your sovereign. Should this continue, none will be more glad than I; but if you decay, (as I fear ye shall,) then call to mind by what means the Most High exalted you: it was neither by trifling with impiety, nor maintaining pesti-

[1] Knox, p. 354, 19th May 1563.

[2] Ibid. p. 356.—Keith, p. 239. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 28th February, 1562-3. Also Keith, p. 239. From the shattered MS. Randolph to Cecil, 20th May 1563.

[3] Knox, p. 358.—Randolph to Cecil, 3d June 1563.—Keith, p. 239. The address had been written in French, but she translated it, and spoke it in English.

lent papists." So incensed was Moray with this remonstrance, that, for a year and a half, he and Knox scarcely exchanged words together.[1]

Far from being intimidated by this desertion, the Reformer seized the opportunity of the parliament to address the nobility upon the subject of God's mercies to them as a commonwealth, and their own ingratitude. He had been with them, he declared, in their most desperate temptations; he was now with them in the days of their success and forgetfulness, and it was some relief to pour forth the sorrows of his heart, to remind them of the perils they had survived—to warn them of the duties they had neglected. "I see," said he, getting animated in his subject, and suddenly stretching out his arms as if he would leap from the pulpit and arrest the vision passing before him,[2] "I see before me the beleagured camp at St Johnston: I see your meeting on Cupar Muir; I hear the tramp of the horsemen as they charged you in the streets of Edinburgh: and, most of all, is that dark and dolorous night now present to my eyes in which all of you, my lords, in shame and fear left this town—and God forbid I should ever forget it!—what was then, I say, my exhortation unto you? and what is fallen in vain of all that God ever promised you by my mouth? Speak, I say, for ye yourselves live to testify. There is not one of you against whom death and destruction were threatened who hath perished in that danger; and how many of your enemies hath God plagued before your eyes? And is this to be the thankfulness ye shall render unto your God, to betray His cause, when you have it in your hands to establish it as you please? The queen says, 'Ye will not agree with her.' Ask of her that which by God's Word ye may justly require; and if she will not agree with you in God, ye are not bound to agree with her faction in the devil. Let her plainly understand so far of your minds; forsake not your former courage in God's cause, and be assured He will prosper you in your enterprises. And now, my lords," he concluded, "to put an end to all, I hear of the queen's marriage: dukes, brethren to emperors and kings, strive all for the best gain. But this, my lords, will I say—note the day, and bear witness hereafter: whenever the nobility of Scotland, who profess the Lord Jesus, consent that an infidel (and all papists are infidels) shall be head to our sovereign, ye do as far as in you lieth to banish Christ Jesus from this realm, and to bring God's vengeance on the country."[3]

This extraordinary licence, and the boldness with which the Reformer availed himself of his sacred character to attack the sovereign, and dictate to the council, called forth the indignation both of Catholics and Protestants.[4] He was summoned to answer before the queen, and, coming to court after dinner, was brought into her cabinet by Erskine of Dun, the superintendent of Angus and Mearns. Mary, whose feelings were keen, upbraided him with his ingratitude; she had borne, she said, with all his severest censures; she had sought his friendship, had offered him audience and preferment, but all in vain; nothing would mollify, nothing would silence him; and as she said this, she began to weep and lament aloud, exclaiming, that he had nothing to do with her marriage, and warning him, with broken words and passionate gestures, to beware of her revenge. As soon as he could be heard, Knox attempted to defend himself, affirming, that in the pulpit he was not master of himself, but must obey His commands who had bade him speak plain, and flatter no flesh; as for the favours which had been offered to him, his vocation, he said, was neither to wait in the courts of princes nor

[1] Knox, p. 357.

[2] Melvil's Diary, p. 26. "He was like to ding the pulpit in blads [tatters] and flee out of it."

[3] Knox, p. 359.

[4] Knox, p. 359. "These words," says he, "and this manner of speaking, were judged intolerable. Papists and Protestants were both offended."

in the chambers of ladies, but to preach the gospel.—"I grant it so," reiterated the queen; "but what have you to do with my marriage? or what are you within the commonwealth?" —"A subject born within the same," said the Reformer; "and albeit, madam, neither baron, lord, nor belted earl, yet hath God made me, how abject soever in your eyes, a useful and profitable member. As such, it is my duty, as much as that of any one of the nobility, to forewarn the people of danger; and, therefore, what I have said in public I here repeat to your own face. Whenever the nobility of this realm shall so far forget themselves as to consent that you shall be subject to an unlawful husband, they do as much as in them lieth to renounce Christ, to banish the truth, betray the freedom of the realm, and, perchance, may be but cold friends to yourself."[1]

This new attack brought on a still more passionate burst of tears; and Mary, who could scarcely be appeased by the soothing speeches of the Laird of Dun, commanded Knox to quit the apartment. In obeying this, a scene occurred which was strikingly characteristic: the Reformer, passing into the outer chamber, found himself shunned and avoided by the nobles of the court, who looked strangely on him, as if they had never known him before. His temper was not, however, of the kind to be cast down by the desertion of these summer friends; and, observing a circle of the ladies of the queen's household sitting near, in their gorgeous apparel, he could not depart without a word of admonition. "Ah, fair ladies," said he, between jest and earnest, "how pleasant were this life of yours, if it should ever abide, and then in the end we might pass to heaven with this gear! But fie on that knave, Death—that will come whether ye will or not; and when he hath laid on the arrest, then foul worms will be busy with this flesh, be it never so fair and tender; and the silly soul, I fear, shall be so feeble that it can neither carry with it gold, garnishing, targating, pearl, nor precious stones."[2] In the midst of these speeches, the Laird of Dun came out of the queen's cabinet, and requested Knox to go home; nor does it appear that Mary took any further notice of his officious and uncalled-for interference with her marriage.

When Lethington returned from his prolonged embassy to England and France, he expressed much indignation against the violence of Knox and his party; he affirmed that the reports which they had raised, regarding a match with Spain, tended directly to excite the jealousy of Elizabeth, and to create unworthy suspicions between the Scottish queen and her Protestant subjects. To discredit the Reformer, who had already quarrelled with Moray, became his great object, and this added bitterness to the schism which divided the more moderate from the more violent of the Protestants. We cannot wonder, indeed, that the fearless and declared opposition of this extraordinary man, who possessed great power, not only over his own friends, but over the people, provoked and thwarted so refined and crafty a politician as Lethington; and as Knox corresponded with Cecil, and was indefatigable in procuring secret information both from England and the Continent, the secretary found him no easy enemy to deal with.

Not long after the return of Lethington, and when every proceeding on the part of Mary and her ministers was dictated by an anxious desire to conciliate Elizabeth, the Reformer, instead of seconding these efforts, addressed to Cecil a letter full of suspicion and alarm. He assured him, that out of the twelve who formed the queen's council, nine had been gained over to that which, in the end, would prove their destruction.[3] Everything,

[1] This must have been in May, 1563. Knox, p. 361.

[2] Knox, p. 361. "He *merrily* said." The speech is in the very vein of Hamlet—"Get ye to my lady's chamber, and tell her, let her paint an inch thick, to this favour she must come—make her laugh at that."

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Knox to Cecil, 6th October 1563.

he added, depended on the firmness of Moray; if he failed or faltered, all was lost. As for himself, he declared, he was prepared for the worst, and had little to fear on his own account; but it was lamentable to see the dark cloud of calamities which was preparing to burst upon his country, and all because men must follow the inordinate affections of her who was born to be the plague of her realm. The key to part of this despondency is to be found in a sentence of the same letter, which, alluding to a late progress of the queen, informed Cecil, that "the conveying of the mass through these quarters, which longest had been best reformed, had dejected the hearts of many, and caused him to disclose the plainness of a troubled heart."[1] Yet although probably he was over-excited, and too much alarmed, it is certain that Knox had good ground to believe that intrigues, for the marriage of the queen with some foreign potentate of her own religion, were then secretly agitated both in Scotland and on the Continent.

It was probably her conviction of the truth of this which at the last drove Elizabeth from all her delays and excuses, and compelled her to point out plainly to Mary some prince or noble person whom she judged worthy of her hand. To the astonishment of her council, she proposed her favourite Leicester, then the Lord Robert Dudley, and sent instructions to Randolph to sound the inclinations of the Scottish queen, and confer with Moray and Lethington upon the subject. As, however, he was not yet authorised to give the name,[2] these wary ministers, although they saw to whom he pointed, hesitated to meddle in so delicate a matter. They suspected, and not without good ground, the sincerity of the English queen; and hinted that, considering the affection which bound her to Dudley, and him to his royal mistress, it could not be believed that she would part with her lover, or he be so base as to forsake her even for a crown.[3] Randolph's perplexity in conducting these nice and difficult negotiations was strongly expressed in a letter which at this time he addressed to Cecil. "To persuade the Queen of Scotland," he observed, "to marry any man under the rank of a prince, would be a dangerous and dishonourable task for any subject to adventure; and even if Mary were ready to forget her royal dignity, and listen for a moment to the proposal of Elizabeth, there remained," he said, "a greater difficulty behind. In offering the noblest in England, none could be at a loss to divine who was meant. But how unwilling," he continued, "the queen's majesty herself would be to depart from him, and how hardly his mind could be divorced or drawn from that worthy room where it is placed, let any man see, where it cannot be thought but it is so fixed for ever, that the world would judge worse of him than of any living man, if he should not rather yield his life than alter his thoughts. Wherefore, this they (he alludes to Moray and Lethington) conclude, as well for her majesty's part, as for him who is so happy to be so far in her grace's favour, that if this queen would wholly put herself into Elizabeth's will, as to receive a husband of her selecting, either she should not have the best, or at least match herself with him that hath his mind placed already elsewhere; or if it can be withdrawn from thence, she shall take a man unworthy, from his disloyalty and inconstancy, to marry with any, much less with a queen. Whereupon, they, knowing both their affections, and judging them inseparable, think rather that no such thing is meant on my sovereign's part, and that all these offers bear a greater show of good will than any good meaning."[4]

Hitherto Randolph had not been

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Knox to Cecil, 6th October 1563.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 21st February 1563-4, Randolph to Cecil. "For whom the Queen's Majesty's Instructions licenseth me not to name, of him it shall not almost become me to have one word."

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 21st February 1563-4.

[4] Ibid.

permitted to name any one; but shortly after, Elizabeth having caught alarm at the continued intrigues for the marriage of Mary with some foreign prince, sent him a more distinct commission on the subject; and, choosing a moment when Moray and Lethington were at the council, and Mary slenderly attended, he informed her of the wishes of his mistress, and named Lord Robert Dudley. She complained that, after long delay, he was now needlessly precipitate, and had taken her by surprise. She looked, she said, to have heard of peace between France and England, and of no such difficult matter as he had abruptly introduced. The English minister urged the necessity of a speedy decision on so important a point as her marriage, and the fair and honourable offer which was now made to her. "Your own mistress," replied Mary, "has been somewhat longer of deciding than I have been; and you know she hath counselled me to have regard to three points, whereof the special one was honour. Now, think you, Master Randolph, that it will be honourable in me to imbase my state, and marry one of her subjects? Is this conformable to her promise to use me as her sister or daughter, to advise me to marry my Lord Robert—to ally myself with her own subject."[1]

To this Randolph, waving the point most difficult to answer, urged the advantage which might result to the tranquillity and happiness of both kingdoms, and intimated that the Queen of England, by the honour and preferments with which she intended to endow Dudley, would render him not unworthy of so exalted an alliance. Mary perceived he wished her to believe that his mistress might acknowledge her right of succession, and settle the kingdom upon her and Dudley; but even this did not tempt her. "Where is my assurance," said she, "in this? What if the queen your mistress should marry herself, and have children? What have I then gotten? who will say I have acted wisely to take this step, which requires long consideration, on so sudden a proposal as this? I have conferred with no one; and although willing not to mistrust your mistress, the adventure is too great." In reply, Randolph begged the queen to speak on the subject to Moray, Lethington, and Argyle. She agreed; and communicated Elizabeth's proposal to them the same day after supper; but Lethington informed the English envoy, that although his mistress was pleased that, after so much obscure dealing, the Queen of England at last began to speak plainly, she deemed it prudent, when all was yet so vague, to give no more definite answer than that sent to her last letter.[2]

If the English queen had been sincere in this proposal; had she consented, as the basis of Mary's marriage with Dudley, to acknowledge her right of succession, and agreed to confirm it by an act of the legislature, settling the crown upon their children, Moray and Lethington were ready to use all their influence to promote the union, and it is very probable that the Scottish queen would have embraced the offer.[3] Upon no other supposition can we account for her conduct during this trying and tantalizing negotiation. She exhibited no indignation when the overture was first made by Randolph; she bore every delay with patience, and evinced every disposition to oblige Elizabeth. At her request and earnest recommendation, the Earl of Lennox, who had for many years been banished from Scotland, and whose proceedings against his native country had been hostile and treasonable, obtained permission to return, and was allowed to hope that his royal mistress would receive him with favour.[4] For some time nothing had been said of the intended inter-

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 30th March 1564.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 30th March 1564.

[3] On the 18th March 1563-4, the queen issued a proclamation, declaring her determination to support the "religion" as she found it on her arrival. MS. Book of Privy-council, folio 126.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Elizabeth to Mary. Draft by Cecil, 16th June 1563.

view between the two queens, and it had broken off on the part of Elizabeth; but when this princess now suddenly renewed her proposal for a meeting, although Mary's ministers, aware that it was merely a colour for delay, declined the overture, the Scottish queen herself was grieved that they did so, and earnestly desired it.[1]

On her part, therefore, and in the conduct of Moray and Lethington, everything at this moment was open and friendly. On the side of Elizabeth and Cecil, on the other hand, there had been pursued, for the last three years, such a complicated system of delay, mystery, and caprice, as to create a suspicion in the minds of the Scottish ministers that the English queen was really hostile to the marriage, that she had not the slightest intention of giving up Leicester, and still less of settling the succession upon Mary. "If," said Lethington, addressing Cecil, "a conjunction be really meant, and you will prosecute the means to draw it on which were opened up by the queen my mistress's last answer, I doubt not but you will find conformity enough on this part; but if time be always driven without farther effect than hath yet followed upon any message which hath passed between them these three years, I am of opinion he shall in the end think himself most happy who hath least meddled in the matter. Gentle letters, good words, and pleasant messages, be good means to begin friendship amongst princes; but I take them to be too slender bands to hold it fast."[2] He then adds a remark which is strikingly descriptive of Cecil's mysterious diplomacy. "In these great causes between our sovereigns, I have ever found that fault with you, that as in your letters you always wrote obscurely, so in private communications you seldom uttered your own judgment: you might well *academico more* dispute *in utramque partem*, leaving me in suspense to collect what I would. So, I fear, in giving advice you will walk so warily, rather [being intent] to speak nothing that may any time thereafter hurt yourself, than to speak all things that might further the matter; and I will confess I have of late enforced my natural [disposition] to learn this same lesson of you, for the reverence I bear you, that your manner of doing serves me for instruction to direct my proceeding. Marry, I fear the common affairs do not fare a whit the better for our too great wariness."[3]

Elizabeth was at last driven by the conduct of Mary and her ministers, to that perplexity which is the general fate of duplicity when opposed to plain and direct dealing. As a last pretext for delay, she availed herself of some secret information transmitted by Knox to Randolph, regarding the alleged intrigues of Lennox in Scotland.

This highly-allied noble had, as we have seen, obtained permission to return to that country a short time before this,[4] and at the earnest entreaty of Elizabeth, Mary promised to lend a favourable ear to his suits. Strictly speaking, Lennox was still an outlaw, for the sentence of his forfeiture could only be removed by an act of the legislature; yet the entreaty of the English queen, the recommendation of Cecil, and the powerful interest of Moray and the Secretary Lethington, were successfully exerted in his behalf. Randolph also had instructions from Elizabeth to promote his views; and when about to leave the English court, he not only received Mary's permis-

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 5th June 1564. Also same to Lord Robert Dudley, same date.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 6th June 1564.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 6th June 1564.

[4] The return of Lennox to Scotland is described by Keith, p. 254, as occurring on the 27th September; and the same accurate author corrects the error of Buchanan and Spottiswood who place his return in September 1563. The Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 77, states that Lennox came to Edinburgh on the 23d September. From a letter of Bedford to Cecil, MS. State-paper Office, dated 25th September 1564, compared with another letter, from the same to the same, dated 19th September, MS. State-paper Office, B.C., I believe this authority to be correct.

sion, under her great seal, to revisit his native country, but was flattered with the hope that his forfeiture would be removed, and himself replaced in the high station which belonged to his birth.

This anticipated restoration caused immediate alarm to Knox and his party. It was more than suspected that both Lennox and his son were Papists; and the Reformer, in a gloomy letter to Randolph, strongly deprecated their return.[1] His fears were instantly communicated to Elizabeth; and this princess, who was watching for a pretext to delay any negotiation on the subject of the marriage with Dudley, eagerly availed herself of this circumstance to commence a fresh system of duplicity and delay. She instantly took steps to detain the earl in England; and, although it was to gratify her own wishes, most earnestly expressed to Lethington, that Mary had consented to receive him into favour, yet, with extraordinary inconsistency, she now commanded Cecil to address letters to Moray and Lethington, requiring them to persuade the Scottish queen to revoke her promise, and countermand his return into her kingdom. These able men, however, at once detected her object, and met her with a peremptory refusal. The correspondence which passed upon the subject is extremely important, in reference to the events which soon after occurred; and their reply to Cecil was so sarcastic and severe, that it gave offence both to the English queen and her pliant minister.[2]

Alluding to the secret information which the English secretary had stated he had received from some of his best friends in Scotland, "I cannot tell," said Lethington, "whom you take to be your best friends; but I think you ought to judge those to be best who most earnestly go about to maintain quietness between the two realms, and intelligence between the princesses, wherein I am well assured my Lord of Moray and myself have done as good offices as any other; and for us, I am bold to say, neither of us have any misliking in the matter, but rather have been instruments to further than to hinder his coming; and if any other report of our meaning be made from hence, the author thereof (he here probably alludes to Knox) hath followed his own passion, being nothing privy to our intents, abusing our names on a purpose which we do not allow."[3]

He next adverted to the sudden change in the queen's mind upon the subject of Lennox's return. That Elizabeth should now oppose it was "not a little marvellous," he observed, "seeing how earnestly her majesty did recommend unto me my Lord of Lennox's cause, and my lady's, at my last being in that court; nay," he continued, "suddenly after I had taken my leave, you yourself, at her majesty's commandment, did send after me by post her letters to the queen's majesty, my mistress, very affectionate in their favour, willing me to present the same with recommendation from the queen." He next remarked, that the sole cause which had moved him to exert his influence for Lennox, was the request of the English queen, which he believes also to have been his chief recommendation to Mary. "And now," said he, "having once, under her great seal, permitted him liberally to come, it will be a hard matter to persuade her majesty to revoke it; and I dare little presume to enter into any such communication with her majesty, knowing how much she doth respect her honour where promise is once passed, and how unwilling she is to change her deliberations being once resolved; which," he adds, "as she will not do herself, so doth she altogether mislike in all others."

He then alluded to Knox's apprehensions regarding the effects which Lennox's return might produce upon

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, —— 3d, 1564. The date, I suspect, (from internal evidence, and a comparison with other letters,) must be 3d of September.

[2] Elizabeth's Instructions to Randolph, 4th October 1564. Keith, p. 257.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 13th July 1564.

the state of the reformed religion. "The religion here," he observed, "doth not depend upon my Lord of Lennox's coming, neither do those of the religion hang upon the sleeves of any one or two that may mislike his coming. For us, whether he come or not come, I take to be no great matter, up or down. Marry, that the stay should grow upon the queen's majesty's side here, it should somewhat touch her majesty in honour, having once permitted his licence so freely; unless she might shadow the change of her mind by the queen, her good sister's request, and forbid it for her pleasure, which I perceive is not your sovereign's meaning; who wishes[1] she would take the matter upon herself, which she thinketh too hard."[2] Moray, in a letter of the same date as the above, which he addressed to Cecil, expressed himself in terms more brief, but still more emphatic. "As to the faction," says he, "that his coming might make for the matters of religion, thanks to God, our foundation is not so weak that we have cause to fear if he had the greatest subject of this realm joined to him, seeing we have the favour of our prince, and liberty of our conscience in such abundance as our hearts can wish. It will neither be he nor I, praised be God, can hinder or alter religion hereaway; and his coming or remaining in that cause will be to small purpose."[3] The English queen had addressed to Mary a letter at the same time, and to the same effect; but she replied with so much spirit, and used so little care to conceal her opinion of such inconsistent conduct, that Elizabeth was deeply offended.[4]

Thus foiled in this secret intrigue against Lennox, Elizabeth withdrew her opposition. She had been careful to have all evidence of it destroyed;[5] and, to the world, therefore, everything appeared open, and consistent. The earl received her licence to leave England, and on the 23d of September, he arrived in Edinburgh, bringing with him a strong letter of recommendation from the English queen,[6] which Mary, who knew her real sentiments, must have read with no very favourable opinion of her sincerity. This princess was then absent, on a northern progress, but she returned before the end of the month; and Lennox, having been invited by his royal mistress to present himself at court, obeyed her injunction with much state and ceremony. He rode to the palace of Holyrood, having twelve gentlemen before him, splendidly mounted and clothed in black velvet; behind him came a troop of thirty attendants bearing his arms and livery: having dismounted, the queen instantly sent for him, and their interview, which took place in the presence of the nobility, was flattering and cordial.[7] Mary immediately communicated these particulars to Elizabeth, informing her, that from her anxiety to shew deference to her request, she had not only already given the earl some proof of her goodwill, but meant also to "proceed further to his full restitution, whereby he should be able to enjoy the privileges of a subject, the liberty of his native country, and his old titles."[8] Soon after, the restored lord invited Randolph to dinner; and the ambassador wrote to Cecil an account of the entertainment, which proves, that the Scottish queen had been as good as her word. "I dined with my Lord of Lennox," said he, "being by him required in the morning. I found nothing less for the beautifying and furniture of his lodging than your honour hath heard by

[1] In the original, "who would."

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 13th July 1564.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Earl of Moray to Cecil, 13th July 1564.

[4] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 116. Bannatyne edit.

[5] Lethington says to Cecil, "I have used the best means I could to recover the queen's letter, that I might have returned it again to her highness, but I was answered, that the letter was burnt at her own request. . . . I have, according to your desire, returned unto you your own letter."

[6] Keith, p. 254.

[7] Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, p. 77.

[8] Keith, p. 255, Mary to Elizabeth. Keith printed from a contemporary copy, which leaves the day of the month blank. The original is in the State-paper Office, dated 28th September 1564.

report; the house well hanged, two chambers very well furnished, one special rich and fair bed, where his lordship lieth himself, and a passage made through the wall to come the next way into court when he will. I see him honourably used of all men, and that the queen's self hath good liking of his behaviour. There dined with him the Earl of Athole, in whom he reposes singular trust, and they are seldom asunder, saving when the Earl of Lennox is at the sermon. [Athole was a Roman Catholic.] There was also his brother, the Bishop of Caithness, a Protestant, who sometimes preacheth. His lordship's cheer is great and his household many, though he hath despatched divers of his train away. He findeth occasion to disburse money very fast, and of his £700 brought with him, I am sure that much is not left. If he tarry long, Lennox may, perchance, be to him a dear purchase. He gave the queen a marvellous fair and rich jewell, whereof there is made no small account; a clock, and a dial curiously wrought and set with stones; and a looking-glass very richly set with stones, in the four metals; to my Lord of Lethington, a very fair diamond in a ring; to my Lord Athole, another, as also somewhat to his wife—I know not what: to divers others somewhat, but to my Lord of Moray nothing. He presented, also, each of the Marys with such pretty things as he thought fittest for them; such good means he hath to win their hearts, and to make his way to further effect. The bruit is here, that my lady herself, and my Lord Darnley are coming after, insomuch that some have asked me if she were upon the way. This I find, that there is here marvellous good liking of the young lord, and many that desire to have him here."[1]

Whilst Lennox found himself thus happily restored after so long a banishment, and when Mary enjoyed the satisfaction of extending to him her favour and forgiveness, Elizabeth's mind was torn with doubt and reduced to a state of the greatest perplexity. We learn this from the following remarkable letter written in her own hand to Cecil. This minister, her director in every difficulty, was then confined to his chamber by sickness, and the queen, snatching a sheet of paper, wrote to him these few lines in Latin:—"In ejusmodi laberintho posita sum de responso meo reddendo R. [reginæ] Scotiæ, ut nescio quomodo illi satisfaciam, quum neque toto isto tempore illi ullum responsum dederim, nec quid mihi dicendum nunc sciam. Invenias igitur aliquid boni quod in mandatis scriptis Randoll dare possem, et in hac causa tuam opinionem mihi indica."[2] This secret confession of the English queen is of much value in determining the truth. There is, we see, no accusation of the policy of Mary, or her ministers Moray and Lethington. Their open dealing upon the two great points of the marriage and the succession is virtually admitted. She complains that it had at last reduced her to a dilemma in which she knew not what to do or what to say, and throws upon Cecil the burden of finding, or inventing, some plausible apology which she may transmit by Randolph, then about to leave the English court for Scotland.

In the meantime the Scottish queen despatched Sir James Melvil, whom she had lately recalled from France, on a mission to Elizabeth. Melvil was an accomplished gentleman, who had been educated in the household of the Constable Montmorency; he was personally acquainted with most of the leading men in France and Ger-

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 24th October 1564. A long, minute, and most interesting letter, of which Keith, p. 259, had only seen a brief abstract in the Cotton Collection.

[2] "I am involved in such a labyrinth regarding the reply to the letter of the Queen of Scots, that I know not how I can satisfy her, having delayed all this time sending her any answer, and now really being at a total loss what I must say. Find me out some good excuse, which I may plead in the despatches to be given to Randolph, and let me know your opinion in this matter." MS. State-paper Office, entirely in the queen's hand-writing, and thus backed by Cecil, "23d September 1564. At St James's, the queen writing to me, being sick."

many; and being a Protestant, Mary believed he would be acceptable to her sister, and might do much to remove any unpleasant feelings which the late embarrassment regarding Lennox had occasioned between them. He was instructed to insinuate himself as much as possible into the confidence of the English queen; to mingle merry discourses with business, and gain her familiar ear; to discover, if possible, her real intentions and wishes on the subject of the marriage, and to keep a strict and jealous eye upon any measures which might be contemplated, regarding Mary's right of succession to the English crown.[1] On both points, he conducted the negotiation with success; and the account of it which he has left in his memoirs presents us with the best portrait of Elizabeth, "as a woman," that has ever been given. The English queen was much pleased with his lively and elegant manners, with his fund of court anecdotes, and the tone of gallantry and devotion with which he addressed her. She frequently sent for him three times a day, questioned him upon the beauty of his royal mistress as compared with her own, insisted on knowing which of them he found fairest, which the best shaped, and whether he liked her most when habited in the English, French, or Italian costume. On one occasion, taking him into her bed-chamber, and opening an escritoire, she shewed him some small miniatures, wrapped up in a paper, upon which the queen had written their names in her own hand. Taking one from among these, she kissed it and held it to Melvil: it was the picture of his royal mistress; and the gallant envoy, snatching Elizabeth's hand, who was not displeased with the familiarity, kissed it "for the love he saw she bore his queen." His eye then caught another on which was written "My Lord's Picture;" Elizabeth would have put it aside; it had been a present from her favourite Leicester; but Melvil earnestly begged a sight: she put it into his hand, and he then playfully said, he would carry it to his own queen in Scotland. "Nay, I have but that one," said she. "True," he replied, "but your majesty possesses the principal," glancing his eye towards the earl, who stood talking to Secretary Cecil at the further end of the chamber.[2] During Melvil's stay at the English court, the Lord Robert Dudley, whom Elizabeth had proposed as a husband for Mary, was created Earl of Leicester with great solemnity; and at the inauguration, Lord Darnley, Lennox's eldest son, bore the sword, as nearest prince of the blood. The ceremony took place at Westminster, "herself," says Melvil, "helping to put on his ceremonial, he sitting on his knees before her, keeping a great gravity and discreet behaviour; but she could not refrain from putting her hand in his neck to kittle [tickle] him, smilingly —the French ambassador and I standing beside her. Then," he continues, "she asked me how I liked him. I said, as he was a worthy subject, he was happy in having encountered a princess that could discern and reward good service. 'Yet,' she said, 'ye like better yonder long lad,' pointing to Lord Darnley. My answer again was, that no woman of spirit would make choice of such a man, who was more like a woman than a man; for he was very lusty, beardless, and lady-faced." In this last sarcasm on Darnley's feminine appearance, the ambassador had an end in view. Mary had given him a secret commission to deal with Lady Lennox, that her son should pass into Scotland to see the country and visit his father, and he was anxious that Elizabeth should have no suspicion of any such overture on the part of the Scottish queen.[3] During the nine days that he remained at the English court, Melvil continued to be treated with much confidence and familiarity. Elizabeth assured him that the subject of Mary's right to the succession of the crown of England, should be treated of in an approaching meeting of commissioners

[1] Melvil's Memoirs, Bannatyne edit., p. 112-114, inclusive.

[2] Melvil's Memoirs, Bannatyne edit., p. 122.

[3] Ibid. p. 120.

from both countries, and declared her anxiety to declare her the second person in the realm, provided she listened to her advice on the subject of her marriage. She added, "that it was her own resolution at this moment to remain till her death a virgin queen, and that nothing would compel her to change her mind, except the undutiful behaviour of the queen her sister." Melvil smiled incredulously, and shook his head, observing, "that he knew she would never marry, because let Mary do what she would, the Queen of England had 'too stately a stomach' to suffer a commander;" adding, "you think if you were married, you would be only Queen of England, and now ye are king and queen both."[1] She earnestly wished she could see Mary. "Why should not your highness," said the ambassador, "disguise yourself as a page, and let me carry you secretly into Scotland; it would occupy but a few days, and for the time, it might be given out in the palace that you were sick and kept your chamber." "Alas," said the queen, much pleased with the romantic proposal, "would that it could be done!" When, some time after this, he begged to have his answer, that he might return home, she upbraided him with being sooner tired of her company than she was of his, and laid a little plot, by which he might be witness to her musical skill, and yet save her vanity from the appearance of a studied exhibition. Lord Hunsdon, after dinner, drew him aside to a quiet gallery, where he might hear some music, laying his finger on his mouth, and whispering that Elizabeth was playing on the virginals. The corridor was separated from the royal chamber only by a curtain, behind which Melvil listened for a while, then drawing it softly aside, and perceiving that her majesty's back was towards him, he slipt into the chamber, and heard her execute a piece admirably well. The queen, however, suddenly turned round, and running forward, as if ashamed, threatened to strike him with her left hand. "She was not used," she said, "to play before men," and asked him, "how he came there." The ambassador did not find it difficult to appease the royal anger. "He was walking in the gallery," he said, "with Lord Hunsdon, when his ear was ravished with her melody, which drew him into the chamber he could scarcely tell how; he implored her pardon, but he had been brought up in a foreign court, where the manners were less grave than in England, and was ready to bear any punishment her highness chose to inflict." Elizabeth was much pleased, she sat down on a cushion, and when Melvil knelt beside her, asked him, whether she or Mary played best. He gave her the delight of hearing, that in music she excelled Mary, and she declared she would not let him away till he had seen her dance.[2]

On his return to Scotland the ambassador informed his mistress of Elizabeth's strong protestations of friendship and attachment, but being pressed by the Scottish queen to give his opinion of her sincerity, declared his conviction that she had little upright meaning; on the contrary, he had detected, he said, much dissimulation and jealousy: she had already hindered her marriage with the Archduke Charles, and she now offered Leicester, who was the last man she would part with.[3] In the meantime Randolph, who for a considerable period had been resident at the English court, was despatched into Scotland with instructions to renew the proposals regarding Leicester; but his promises were so vague, and his answers, when pressed by Moray and Lethington, so obscure, evasive, and dilatory, that these ministers could arrive at no definite conclusion,[4] and dreaded to commit themselves. A secret meeting was held between them and the Earl of Bedford at Berwick, but it led to no more satis-

[1] Melvil's Memoirs, Bannatyne edit., p. 122.

[2] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 125.

[3] Ibid. p. 129.

[4] MS. Instructions, State-paper Office, Draft by Cecil, 7th October 1564. Also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 4th Nov. 1564.

factory result.[1] Repeated conferences then took place with Randolph. This crafty and discerning envoy assured Cecil and his royal mistress, that although Mary was worn out with delays, and pressed by foreign suitors, and agitated by idle and malicious rumours arising from her remaining unmarried, still she continued to be animated by the same friendly feelings towards Elizabeth, she spoke of her with affection and respect, and seemed inclined to think her sincere regarding the marriage with Dudley.[2] Her ministers assured him, that if his royal mistress would perform their sole and simple request—if she would procure it to be declared by act of parliament, that Mary was next to herself in succession to the English crown, they would undertake to overthrow all foreign practices for her marriage, and accomplish the union with Leicester.[3] That nobleman had in the meantime written such humble and flattering letters to Mary that she was much prepossessed in his favour; she shewed herself averse to the foreign offers made to her through her uncle the cardinal, and, judging impartially from the whole tenor of the negotiations, there seems little doubt that the Scottish queen, upon the conditions mentioned, would have agreed to marry Leicester.

On the 14th of December Randolph again wrote to Cecil; he referred to the letter lately addressed to this minister by Maitland and Moray, and he then observed, "The stay now standeth either in the queen's majesty to have all this performed, or in his Lordship's self, [Leicester,] that hath the matter so well framed to his hand, that much more, I believe, there need not be than his own consent, with that which may be for the queen's majesty's honour to do for him. It abideth now no longer deliberation. You have the offer, you have the choice. . . . It is now looked for, that to the letter written to your honour there come a full and resolute answer." He proceeds to enumerate the causes which move them thus earnestly to solicit an end. "Age," says he, "time, necessity of her state, cempel her to marry; her people, her friends, press her thereunto. The offers made are such as not without good cause they can be refused, though some inconveniences may arise sooner in matching with one than with another; practices there are divers in hand." Alluding to the two great suitors, Leicester and Darnley, of whose intended journey into Scotland many whispers now ran in the country, he observes:—"That which in this case is not a little to be considered, is, that I have inquired of themselves, and find it true by others, that there is no man for whom, hitherto, any suit hath been made to match with this queen, that shall be more grateful or more acceptable to the people, than shall be my Lord Robert. There hath been more thought of my Lord Darnley before his father's coming than is at this present. . . . The father is now here well known; the mother more feared a great deal than beloved of any that knoweth her. To any other than yourself, if I should write in this sort, my wit would greatly fail me."[4] . . . These urgent requests of Randolph produced little effect. Cecil, completely under the control of his mistress, did not venture to move a step without her warrant, and as he

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 12th Nov. 1564.

[2] Ibid., 2d December 1564.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 3d December 1564, Moray and Lethington to Cecil. Also, Ibid., 24th December 1564. Moray and Lethington to Cecil.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 14th December 1564. He adds this sentence, which mentions a fact I have not elsewhere seen noticed, the influence which Lady Lennox had over the mind of Mary, queen of England:—"To think that Lord Darnley should marry this queen, and his mother to bear that stroke [have that influence] with her, that she bore with Queen Mary, (which she is like to do, as you can conjecture the causes why,) would alienate as many minds from the queen's majesty, my sovereign, by sending home as great a plague into this country as that which, to her majesty's great honour and perpetual love of the faithful and godly, she drove out of the same when the French were forced to retire themselves."

found it impossible to induce her to make any special offer, or to consent to the demands of Mary's ministers, he was compelled to involve his answers in passages of such interminable length and obscure meaning, that, to use Randolph's phrase, "Lethington and Moray were worked up to great agonies and passions."[1] Nor was it wonderful it should be so. They had engaged in a perilous negotiation, on their sole responsibility; the queen their mistress, had intrusted them, indeed, with a general commission, but they had gone far beyond their instructions, and had expressed themselves in such terms as, if once discovered, must have brought them into immediate suspicion. In writing to Cecil they allude to *his* situation, as contrasted with *their own*, in the following remarkable passage:—"We immediately resolved to answer you without any drift of time, being more easy for us, for one respect, so to do, than it was for you to answer our former letter; forasmuch as *we* have none with whom we either dare or will communicate anything passed between us, and *you* were compelled to make your sovereign privy to our letter, before you might answer it. Truth it is, that in another point *you* have more advantage, in that you have a sufficient warrant for what you write, and so work surely, writing nothing but that your mistress both knoweth and doth allow; and we, without any commandment or warrant, write such things as, being brought to light, were sufficient matter to overthrow our credit at our sovereign's hand, and put all we have in danger. Although our conscience doth not accuse us that we intend any prejudice to her majesty, yet in princes' affairs, matters be as they list to take them; and it will not be allowed for a good reason, when they call their ministers to account, to say we meant well." "In your letter," they observe, "you have well provided that we shall find no lack for shortness thereof; yet, to speak squarely our opinion, we think you could in fewer lines have comprehended matter more to our contentation; and better for furtherance of the purpose intended, if you had a sufficient warrant, and therewithal a mind to fall roundly to work with us. . . . When we came to those words—that seeing us mean to fall roundly to work, you will go also roundly to work with us, and proceed plainly—we looked for a plain resolution; but, having read over that which followed, you must bear with us if we find ourselves nothing satisfied: . . . for in that same plain speech, there be many obscure words and dark sentences, and, (pardon us that we say so,) in a manner, as many words as there be, as many ambiguities do result thereof."[2]

In the midst of these protracted negotiations, a parliament was held at Edinburgh, in which Mary fulfilled her promise to the Earl of Lennox. His forfeiture was reversed, his estates and honours restored, whilst the queen, to give the greater solemnity to this act of favour, came herself to the House, and in a short address informed the estates, that one of the chief causes which moved her to replace this baron in his former power and station, was the earnest suit of the queen, her good sister of England.[3] At the same time the act against the mass was confirmed in all its severity. To be present at its celebration was made punishable by the loss of lands, goods, and even life, if the prince should think fit; nor were any exempted from the full penalties of the statute, except the queen and her household. This confirmation of a severe and unjust law might, at least, have convinced the more rigid Protestants that Mary remained true to the promise she had made on her first arrival; whilst her continued favour to Moray, and

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 9th January 1564-5, Randolph to Cecil.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Moray and Lethington to Cecil, 24th December 1564.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 15th December 1564. His restoration was proclaimed with great solemnity by five heralds, at the cross, which was hung with tapestry, and surrounded by the lords sitting on horseback. Stevenson's Illustrations of the Reign of Queen Mary, p. 111.

the parliamentary sanction given to the late grant of his new earldom, manifested the sincerity of her dealing towards him to whom she committed the chief management of her affairs.

Shortly after this, the great affair of the marriage with Leicester seemed, from what cause is not easily discoverable, to assume a more decided form. Lethington thanked Cecil for a friendly and gentle letter, and rejoiced in the hopes it led him to entertain of the ultimate success of that good work which he had begun.[1] Mary also, who had retired for some time to St Andrews, to throw off the cares of state and the restraints and formalities of her court, received Randolph with expressions of unfeigned friendship and openness, declaring her determination, if Elizabeth agreed to the offer made by her ministers, to abide by her wishes, and to be guided by her instructions in all things. At first, indeed, she playfully refused to listen to any introduction of grave and weighty matters: it was, she said, her holiday time; she had thrown aside her pomp, and lived with a small train in a merchant's house at St Andrews, intent on nothing but to be quiet and happy. Randolph, however, was not to be thus put aside. He dined and supped with her every day, and at last ventured to speak of business. "I had no sooner spoken the word," says he, "but the queen said, 'I see now well that you are weary of this company and treatment. I sent for you to be merry, and to see how like a bourgeois wife I live, with my little troop, and you will interupt our pastimes with your great and grave matters. I pray you, sir, if you be weary here, return home to Edinburgh, and keep your gravity and great embassade until the queen come thither, for I assure you, you shall not get her here; nor I know not myself where she is become. You see neither cloth of estate, nor such appearance, that you should think I am she at St Andrews that I was at Edinburgh.'—'I said,' (continues Randolph,) 'that I was very sorry, for that at Edinburgh she said that she did love my mistress the queen's majesty better than any other, and now I marvelled how her mind was altered.'" Mary upon this became merry, and "called him by more names than were given him in his christendom." . . . . "Well, sir," said she, "that which then I spoke in words shall be confirmed to my good sister your mistress in writing. Before you go out of this town you shall have a letter for her: and for yourself, go where you will, I care no more for you."[2] The next day he was commanded to be at the queen's table, and placed the next person (saving worthy Beaton)[3] to Mary herself. After dinner she rode abroad, and it pleased her, most part of the time, to talk with him. As the queen's conversation at this ride was important, it is perhaps best to give it in her own words, as they were instantly afterwards reported to Elizabeth by Randolph himself. "She had occasion," says the ambassador, "to speak much of France, for the honour she received there to be the wife unto a great king, and for the friendship shewed unto her in particular by many, for which occasions she was bound to love the nation, to shew them pleasure, and do them good. Her acquaintance," she said, "was not so forgotten there, nor her friendship so little esteemed, but yet it was divers ways sought to be continued. She hath of her people many well affected that way, for the nurture they have had there, and the commodity of service, as those of the guard and men-at-arms; besides, great privileges for the merchants, more than ever were granted to any nation. What privately hath been sought (she continued, turning the discourse to her marriage) for a long time, and yet is sought, [namely,] that I should yield myself unto their desires in my marriage, your mistress cannot be

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 1st February 1564-5.

[2] Randolph to Elizabeth, 5th February 1564-5. Printed by Chalmers, Life of Mary, vol. i. p. 190, 8vo edition.

[3] Worthy Beaton was either Mary Beaton, one of her maids of honour, or Beaton, a gentleman mentioned afterwards at p.

ignorant of it, and you have heard. To leave such friends, and to lose such offers, without assurance of as good, nobody will give me advice that loveth me. Not to marry, you know, it cannot be for me. To defer it long, many incommodities ensue; how privy to my mind your mistress hath been herein you know. How willing I am to follow her advice I have shewn many times, and yet I can find in her no resolution or determination. For nothing I cannot be bound unto her;[1] and I have of late given assurance to my brother of Moray, and Lethington, that I am loath to frame my will against hers, and so do now shew unto yourself, which I wish you to bear in mind, and to let it be known unto my sister, your mistress. And, therefore, this I say, and trust me, I mean it: if your mistress will (as she hath said) use me as her natural born sister or daughter, I willl take [consider] myself either the one or the other, as she please, and will shew no less readiness to obey her, and honour her, than my mother or eldest sister; but if she will repute me always as her neighbour the Queen of Scots, how willing soever I be to live in amity, and to maintain peace, yet must she not look for that at my hands that otherwise I would or she desireth.[2] To forsake friendship offered, and present commodity [advantage] for uncertainty, no friend will advise me; nor if I did, would your mistress's self approve my wisdom. Let her, therefore, measure my case as her own, and so will I be hers. For these causes, until my sister and I have further proceeded, I must apply my mind to the advice of those that seem to tender most my profit, that shew their care over me, and wish me most good."

"I have disclosed to you," said she "all my mind, and require you to let it be known to your sovereign. My meaning unto her is plain, and so shall my dealing be. I know how well she is worthy, and so do esteem her; and, therefore, I will say thus much more—that as there is none nearer of kin unto her than I am, nor none more worthy to whom I may submit myself, so is there none to whom with better will I desire to be beholden unto than unto her, or to do anything that may be with my honour."

In the midst of this discourse Mary stopt suddenly, protesting "that she had been drawn on to talk on a subject upon which she had hitherto kept to him a profound silence." Randolph admitted it to be so, but said he knew her mind from her ministers. "I charged them," rejoined the queen, "to consider what was best for me, and I find them bent towards you, and yet I believe they will advise the best; but your mistress may use me [so] that I will leave their advices, and follow hers alone." The ambassador earnestly trusted it might be so. "Remember, then, what I have said," continued the Scottish queen: "this mind cometh not upon the sudden; it is more than a day or two that I have had this thought, and more than this too, that you shall not know." "I desired her grace (proceeds Randolph) not to cut off her talk there, it was so good, so wise, so well framed, and so comfortable unto me, as nothing could be more, to hear that mind in her towards your majesty."

"I am a fool," said Mary, "thus long to talk with you; you are too subtle for me to deal with." Randolph protested upon his honesty, that his meaning was only to nourish a perpetual amity between his mistress and her, and that this could only be done by honest means. "How much better were it," said she, "that we two, being queens, so near of kin, neighbours, and living in one isle, should be friends, and live together like sisters, than by strange means divide ourselves to the hurt of us both. And to say that we may, for all that, live friends,[3] we may say and promise what we will, but it

[1] She means, "I cannot be required to bind myself to Elizabeth, and get nothing in return."

[2] That is to say, "that she desires, and in other circumstances I would willingly give."

[3] That is to say, "that nothing hinders us to live in friendship, continuing as we are now is vain. We may promise what we will, but we cannot perform it."

will pass both our powers. You repute us [Scots] poor, but yet you find us cumbersome enough. We have had loss—ye have taken skaith.[1] Why may it not be so between my sister and me, that we, living in peace and assured friendship, may give our minds, that some as notable things may be wrought by us women, as by our predecessors have been before. Let us seek this honour against some other [rather] than fall at debate among ourselves." "I asked her grace here," says Randolph, "whether she would be content one day, whenever it were, to give her assistance for the recovery of Calais?" At this question Mary laughed, and said, "Many things must pass between my good sister and me before I can give you answer; but I believe to see the day that all our quarrels shall be one; and assure you, if we be not, the fault shall not be in me." Randolph, encouraged by her frankness, pressed her to say "how she liked the suit of my Lord Robert Earl of Leicester, that he might write her opinion of him to Elizabeth."—"My mind towards him," replied Mary, "is such as it ought to be of a very noble gentleman, as I hear say by many; and such a one as the queen your mistress my good sister does so well like to be *her* husband, if he were not her subject, ought not to mislike me to be *mine*. Marry! what I shall do lieth in your mistress's will, who shall wholly guide me and rule me."[2]

Ten days after this letter was written, Henry Lord Darnley, having obtained the permission of Elizabeth, and with strong letters in his favour from Leicester and Sir William Cecil, repaired to Scotland. His avowed errand was to visit his father, and assist him in some private affairs which required the personal presence of the heir of his house;[3] but there is no doubt that other and deeper schemes hung upon this journey. The Countess of Lennox, his mother, an ambitious and intriguing woman, looked forward to his ingratiating himself with Mary; and Elizabeth, who dreaded lest her simulated offer of Leicester should involve her in difficulties, and compel her to part with her favourite, was nowise averse to make the Scottish queen acquainted with this young prince, who, next to herself, was the nearest heir to the English throne. He was received with much distinction by the Earl of Bedford, and having passed a night at Lethington, the seat of Secretary Maitland, arrived at Edinburgh, 12th February 1564–5.[4] Having learnt that the queen was absent in Fife, he passed over the Firth, and was introduced to Mary at the castle of the Wemyss,[5] where, during a short progress, she then resided. His reception was flattering; and his manners and address created a prepossession in his favour, not only amongst the Scottish courtiers, but in the more severe and sarcastic mind of Randolph the English ambassador. As he was aware that his sudden appearance in Scotland must draw the eyes of many upon him, it was his object to conciliate all parties. It was suspected that both his father and himself were Papists; but the young lord put himself under the guidance of Moray, and went to hear Knox preach. After the sermon they returned to the palace; he was introduced to the beauties of the court, and in the evening, at the suggestion of Moray, Darnley danced a galliard with the queen.[6]

But although whispers began to circulate regarding the motives which had brought him to Scotland, there can be no doubt that Mary and her ministers were still intent upon the matrimonial negotiation with England. At this moment she treated with great coldness the overtures of her uncle the Cardinal of Lorraine, who proposed to

[1] Hurt.

[2] Chalmer's Life of Mary, vol. i. p. 190, from the original in the State-paper Office, Randolph to Elizabeth, 5th February 1564-5.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lennox to Cecil, 10th March 1564-5.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 12th February 1564-5.

[5] Wemyss castle, on the shore of the Firth of Forth, in Fife.

[6] His courteous dealing with all men deserved great praise, and is well spoken of.—MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Leicester, 19th February 1564-5. Also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 27th February 1564-5.

procure a papal dispensation for her marriage with the King of France.[1] It was even surmised that she was becoming more open to conviction on the subject of religion; and Randolph playfully accused her of beginning to savour of the Huguenots, requesting her to take counsel of his sovereign. "This must be," said Mary, "when I come to England;" alluding to their long-intended interview. The ambassador asked when that would be. "Whenever your mistress wishes it," was the answer; "and as to marriage, my husband must be such a one as she will give me." He alluded to Leicester. "Of that matter," she replied, "I will say no more till I see greater likelihood; but no creature living shall make me break more of my will than my good sister, if she will use me as a sister; if not, I must do as I may."[2]

Whilst Mary was thus open and candid with the English ambassador, Moray, in still more urgent terms, implored him to bring matters to a conclusion, and persuade his royal mistress to acknowledge Mary's title, and expedite the marriage with Leicester. If this took place, he was content, he said, to lose (as he must do) much of his power and honour, for the satisfaction of having discharged his duty; but if he failed in this, it was almost certain ruin. The queen would dislike and suspect him, because he had deceived her with promises which he could not realise; he was the counsellor and deviser of that line of policy which, for the last five years, had been pursued towards England; he it was that had induced her to defer to Elizabeth, to desert her ancient friends, to renounce every foreign offer. "If," said he, "she marry any other than Leicester, what mind will the new king bear me, that knoweth I have so strongly opposed his advancement If he be a Papist, either we must obey, or fall into new misery and difficulty, whilst I shall be regarded as the ringleader of the discontented. But what need to say more of this, you have often heard me say as much before; and yet we see nothing but drift of time, delays from day to day, to do all for nothing and to get nothing for all."[3] In the same spirit, Lethington besought Cecil to act with more stoutness and courage, and bring the matter to a conclusion. Elizabeth had described the Scottish ministers as transforming the negotiation too much into a matter of bargain. "They looked," she said, "for her death, and hunted after a kingdom;" whilst she jocularly told Melvil that Maitland, in his constant allusions to the succession, was, like a death-watch, ever ringing her knell in her ears. The secretary ably repelled this unworthy notion. "In good faith," said he, "that is not my mistress' meaning. Rather doth she seek, and we also, a probable reason to lay against the objections which shall be made in foreign nations contrary to this match; that they may see it is no vain or light conceit hath moved her to yield to the Queen of England's request in her marriage. . . . . The matter itself hath not so many difficulties, but you may soon remove them all if you list."[4] In a later letter, he eloquently alludes to the honour which would redound to Cecil and himself, if their measures to promote the union of the two kingdoms by this marriage were at last successful. Such a stroke of policy, he remarked, would secure for them a more glorious memory, a more unfading gratitude in the ages to come, than belonged to those "who did most valiantly serve King Edward the First in his conquest, or King Robert the Bruce in his recovery of the country."[5]

These fond anticipations of present felicity and posthumous honour were not destined to be realised. It became at last necessary for Elizabeth to

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 4th March 1564-5.
[2] Ibid.
[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 4th March 1564-5. This conversation with Randolph took place at a dinner at the Earl of Moray's, where none were present but the countess his wife, and Pitarrow the comptroller.
[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, Christmas-day 1564.
[5] Ibid., 1st February 1564-5.

come to a decision; and Randolph was instructed to impart to the Scottish queen her final resolution. It amounted to a peremptory and mortifying denial of every proposal of her ministers. She refused to recognise Mary's title, or to adopt any measures regarding her right of succession, till she had made up her own mind whether she would marry or not.[1] If Mary chose to accept Leicester as a simple earl, and trust to the after munificence of the English queen, she would not have any reason to repent her confidence; but this was the same vague and delusive expectation so long held out, which seemed to promise all, and actually meant nothing. The message of Elizabeth, in short, at once put an end to all negotiation. When Randolph communicated her letter to the Scottish queen, it was evident to him that she was deeply moved, and he heard afterwards that their interview had been followed by a passionate fit of weeping.[2] Lethington at once declared, that after such a communication no one could honestly advise Mary to delay; and Moray, who seemed deeply disappointed, prognosticated a speedy dissolution of all friendship between the two queens. His knowledge of the character of his royal mistress led him to this conclusion. It was Mary's weakness to be hurried away by the predominating influence of some one feeling and object. Warm, generous, and confiding, but, at the same time, ambitious and tenacious of her rights, it had been her favourite and engrossing object for the last four years to prevail upon Elizabeth to recognise her title to the English throne. With this view she had given credit to her professions, borne every delay with patience, checked the advances of foreign suitors, treated her nearest relatives with coldness, and promoted to the highest offices of wealth and power those of her nobles who were most attached to England. Everything had been sacrificed to an imprudent dependence upon the promises of Elizabeth. Almost to the very last she hoped against hope, and shewed an affection which, to the piercing and suspicious eyes of Randolph, was sincere and unequalled.[3] Are we to wonder that, when she suddenly was awakened to the duplicity with which she had been treated; when, in a moment, the mask of pretended amity and affection, so long worn by the English queen, fell to the ground, and the features of fraud, falsehood, and selfishness came out in all their deformity, Mary recoiled with mortification and disgust? Her confidence had been abused; she was the dupe of successful artifice; she might soon be the victim of intrigues of which she knew not the ramifications and extent. Can we be surprised that, under this state of mind, the reaction was immediate and violent? She had long submitted her opinion to others; she now determined to choose for herself. The influence of her uncles and of the court of Rome had been for years on the wane; she was not indisposed now to see it revived. The Protestant nobility and the reformed clergy had been treated ever since her arrival in her dominions with high favour, and the great body of her subjects, who adhered to the ancient faith, were kept under and neglected; it was right now that the balance should be held with a more equal hand between them. Moray had been chosen by her as her chief minister and adviser since she left France; to him she had committed almost regal powers; she had pardoned his rebellion, had accumulated upon him estates and honours, and placed him at the very head of her nobles; she had committed herself to his guidance, it was by his advice she had shaped her policy towards England, it was the road marked out for her by him and Lethington that had led her on to mortification, insult, and defeat. Was it possible that she could continue to those two men the confidence with which she had formerly regarded them? was it unnatural that, when she discovered their entire de-

[1] Keith, p. 270.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 17th March 1564-5.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 15th March 1564-5.

votedness to Elizabeth, she should begin to consider them as merely instruments in her hands, and regard them with suspicion and resentment? Yet, although these feelings must at this moment have influenced her secret resolutions, it was the unhappiness of Mary to be surrounded by those whom she could not trust, or to whom she dared not give power. Had she selected as her counsellors any of the wisest amongst the Roman Catholic clergy, the measure would have been probably met by an instantaneous rising of the people and the reformed preachers; whilst her nobility, alike Catholic and Protestant, had successively shewn themselves venal, selfish, and treacherous. She was compelled, therefore, to temporise and conciliate; and when we consider the fearful elements by which she was surrounded —craft, cruelty, fanaticism, in their worst shapes,—all the fierce and uncontrollable passions which marked a feudal age, and much of the refined vices which her subjects had imported in a lengthened and constant intercourse with France and the Continent—it is difficult to withhold our pity from this still youthful queen, placed without advisers in a situation of such peril and responsibility.

It was necessary, however, to come to a determination. Mary had resolved already on a speedy marriage, and her mind naturally turned to Darnley. His descent was royal, his grandmother being the sister of Henry the Eighth, and his mother cousin-german to Queen Elizabeth.[1] At the installation of Lord Robert Dudley as Earl of Leicester, the reader may remember that Sir James Melvil saw Darnley, as first prince of the blood, bear the sword of state before the queen.[2] His own title to the throne of England was second only to that of the Queen of Scotland; he bore the royal name, and by a marriage with him she believed that she would secure to their children an undoubted and unchallengeable title to the English crown. He was now in his nineteenth year; his conduct since his arrival in Scotland, if we may believe Randolph, (a witness whose feelings against him gives weight to his praise,) had been prudent and popular.[3] He had come to the Scottish court not only with the full approbation, but with the warm recommendation of Elizabeth;[4] and this queen had repeatedly assured Mary that, although she decidedly opposed her marriage to a foreign prince, she might choose any of her English nobility, and be certain of her approbation. When, therefore, she selected Darnley, the Scottish queen had reason to expect the approval of Elizabeth, and, if we except Knox and his party, the concurrence and support of all classes in the state. Nor, although Lennox and his son were both suspected of being Papists, could Mary augur that the English queen would be much dissatisfied on that account. At this very moment a negotiation was suspected to be carrying on for a marriage between England and France. Elizabeth, it was reported at the Scottish court, was every day manifesting a greater favour for the ceremonies of the Roman Church; she had determined to impose upon the English clergy a particular habit, copied from that worn by the clergy of the Church of Rome. She had publicly reproved a preacher, desiring him to return to his text or to hold his peace; she had been seen to wear a rosary and a crucifix; and Bonner had affirmed, with impunity, that there was not one real bishop in England.[5] All this held out encouragement to Mary. It was soon manifest that her choice was fixed on Darnley; and in a dangerous and infectious illness which seized him about

[1] Darnley stood in the relation of cousin to Mary—though by the half-blood only. His mother, the Countess of Lennox, was daughter of Archibald Earl of Angus by the widow of James the Fourth, consequently half-sister of James the Fifth, Mary's father.

[2] Supra, p. 182.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 27th February 1564-5.

[4] Ibid., Bedford to Cecil, 11th February 1564-5.

[5] MS. Letter State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 30th March 1565.

this time, she attended him in person with the utmost care, earnestness, and affection, sitting up with him till midnight, watching his convalescence, and shewing delight at his recovery.[1] In a sister to a favourite brother such devotedness would have been commendable; in a queen to her subject, and still more in an affianced mistress to her future husband, it was undignified and indecorous, and gave a handle to the injurious constructions of her enemies. But it was the misfortune of her ardent disposition that she was always under the domination of some strong and engrossing feeling, which sometimes led her to disregard appearances, and to believe she could never sacrifice enough for the object of her approval; nor did she think of the miserable effects of such flattery and attention upon the youth who was exposed to it. To be thus cherished by a queen, and the most beautiful woman in Europe—by her for whose hands so many kings and princes had sued; to have love, honour, and power soliciting his acceptance; to be raised from a subject to supreme command, and to find a crown dropping on his head, would have been trying to the best balanced and the firmest mind. Are we to wonder that, on the weak and unstable disposition of Darnley, it operated with fatal and most instantaneous effect? He became proud and overbearing; and, treating the ancient nobility with neglect, attached himself principally to Riccio, the queen's secretary for her French correspondence, an Italian, who, being first introduced into the royal household as a musician, had been promoted to this office in consequence of the disgrace of Raulet, her former French secretary.[2] He began also to shew symptoms of a passionate and unmanageable temper; talked with great imprudence of the strong party he had in England;[3] declared openly that Moray's power was exorbitant and dangerous; and made himself in a short time so many enemies, that it was whispered he must soon either change his conduct or lose his life.[4] Nor were the consequences of this extraordinary favour shewn to Lennox and his son less injurious in other quarters. Those who knew best the disposition of the queen began to dread that these nobles would wrest from her the whole power in the state, and that she would herself become nothing but a passive instrument in effecting their purposes of ambition and aggrandisement. The Duke of Chastelherault, under whose regency Lennox had been banished and forfeited, anticipated the total ruin of his house: the party of the Protestants, led by Knox and the preachers, cried out "that they were undone." Moray, with the design of strengthening his faction, but under colour of his aversion to the Popish ceremonies, retired from court; and Randolph reported that the people were universally discontented,[5] whilst he hinted, that if Elizabeth felt herself disposed to raise factions in Scotland, and embroil that country, there never was a fitter time to carry her wishes into execution.[6] Even this was not all. Many brought an accusation against Elizabeth, from which her minister found it difficult to defend her. It was affirmed that she had herself sent Darnley into Scotland with a purpose to bring about the very events which had occurred; that her object was to hinder any potent foreign alliance; to match the queen meanly, and to interrupt the friendly intercourse between the two kingdoms.[7]

In the midst of these unpleasant

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Bedford to Cecil, 23d April 1565.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, March 4, 1564-5. Ibid., same to same, 15th January 1564-5.

[3] Ibid., 21st May 1565. Also, Ibid. MS. Letter, same to same, 3d May 1565.

[4] Randolph to Cecil, 20th March 1564-5, printed in Keith, p. 274. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 3d June 1565.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 17th March 1564-5. Also, same to same, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 18th April 1565. Also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Bedford to Cecil, 28th April 1565.

[6] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 15th April 1565.

[7] Ibid., 18th April 1565.

rumours and surmises, Mary despatched Lethington to the English court, with injunctions to communicate her resolution regarding Darnley, and to use all his influence to procure the approbation of the queen. He arrived at Westminster on the 18th of April, and, as he had anticipated, found Elizabeth not only hostile to the projected alliance, but expressing herself with much bitterness against the Scottish queen. She submitted the proposal to her Privy-council; and, after long deliberations, they declared themselves unanimously opposed to it, pronouncing the measure "prejudicial to both the queens, and consequently dangerous to the weal of both countries."[1] What these dangers were the councillors did not think proper to describe; nor do we learn from any contemporary letters that Lethington exerted his ingenuity to dissipate this alarm.

In the meantime, during his absence, some important events were taking place in Scotland. Bothwell, the mortal enemy of Moray, returned suddenly from France; but the suspicions of treason under which he lay, and the reports which had reached the queen's ears of his abandoned and profligate character, induced her to treat him with the utmost severity.[2] The Earl of Moray, whose life he had repeatedly threatened, demanded justice; and Mary summoned him to stand his trial for high treason in conspiring with the Earl of Arran, three years before, to seize the person of the queen. These events were communicated by Randolph to Cecil, in this graphic and interesting letter, from which (although coloured with his own views and prejudices) we may understand something of the state of parties in Scotland. He first alludes to the expected trial of Bothwell:—"Upon Tuesday, at night, (the 1st of May,) there came to this town my Lords of Moray and Argyle, to keep the day of law against the Earl Bothwell, who appeared not, nor is it yet for certain known what is become of him, though the common report is, that he embarked at North Berwick. The company that came to this town in favour of my Lord of Moray are esteemed five or six thousand; and for my part, I assure your honour, I never saw a greater assembly. More also had come, saving that they were stayed by the queen, who hath shewed herself now of late to mislike that my Lord of Moray so earnestly pursueth him, [Bothwell,] and will not give his advice to take the like advantage upon some others, whom she beareth small affection unto.

"In this matter thus far they have proceeded. Upon Wednesday he was called, and for lack of appearance was condemned in the sum; farther, the queen would not that the justice-clerk should proceed, which hath bred so much misliking, and given occasion of such kind of talk against her grace, for bearing with such men in her own cause,[3] that that which is already spoken passeth all measure."

This was an unfair representation of Randolph. The queen, instead of shewing good will to Bothwell, was strongly prejudiced against him; and, in consequence of his coarse and violent conduct, had recently declared he should never receive favour at her hands.[4] As to the accusation of a conspiracy, it may be remembered that Arran, when he made the disclosure, 31st March 1562,[5] was mad; he then implicated not only Bothwell, but his own father, and had continued insane ever since. What evidence Moray had collected during the lapse of nearly three years we cannot tell; but as this potent accuser came to attend the trial with an army of five thousand men, Bothwell justly considered that his life would be in danger if he appeared, and sent his kinsman, Hep-

[1] 1st May 1565. Keith, pp. 270, 274, 275.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Bedford to Cecil, 24th March 1564-5.

[3] In an affair where the crown was prosecutor. See the Summons of Treason. Pitcairn, Criminal Trials, vol. i. p. 462.*

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 30th March 1564-5. Bothwell had used coarse and scandalous epithets in speaking of the queen herself; so Randolph affirms in this letter.

[5] Supra, p. 161.

burn of Whitsum, to protest his innocence, and to declare his readiness to answer the charge when made quietly, without tumult or intimidation.[1]

The ambassador proceeds to notice the obstinacy of the queen, the discontent of her subjects, and the threatenings which began to circulate, "that if good advice was despised, remedy must be sought by sharper means." "This," he continues, "is not the voice of one or two; they are not the meanest that spake it, nor the unlikeliest to put it in execution, if that way they go to work. I write that but shortly, which in many words and by many men I have heard. . . . The speech of this marriage to any of them all, as divers ways I have attempted to know their mind, is so much contrary to their desires that they think their nation dishonoured, the queen shamed, and country undone.

"A greater plague to herself and them there cannot be—a greater benefit to the queen's majesty could not have chanced than to see this dishonour fall upon her, and to have her so matched as it shall pass her power at any time to attain unto that which hitherto so earnestly she looked for. . . . . She is now, to be short, almost in utter contempt of her people, and so far herself in doubt of them, that without some speedy redress worse is to be feared. Many grievous and sore words have of late escaped her against the duke. Mortally she hateth my Lord of Argyle; and so far suspecteth my Lord of Moray, that, not many days since, she said 'that she saw whereabout he went, and that he would set the crown upon his own head.' How these men have need to look unto themselves your honour doth perceive.

"To this point it is come, that my Lord of Moray and Argyle will at no time be in the court together, that, if need be, the one may relieve or support the other. The duke is content to live at home, and thinketh himself happy if he may die in his bed. The preachers look daily, by some means or other, to have their lives taken from them, or to be commanded to silence, as already she hath done one Mr Thomas Drummond, a godly and learned young man, that preached at Dunblane.

"With my Lord of Argyle there came to this town the Lord David, the duke's son, with most part of the duke's friends. Assured bands and promises are made between the duke and Lord of Moray, that nothing shall be attempted against each other but it shall be defended to the uttermost of their powers. The Earl of Glencairn having been required by the Earl of Lennox to enter into the like band, hath refused it, and joined with the duke. My Lord of Morton this time was absent, but so misliked, that I have not heard any man worse spoken of. He is now in hopes that my Lady's Grace [the Countess of Lennox] will give over her rights of Angus, and so [he] will become friend to that side. In this Lethington laboureth, not much to his own praise. The Lord Ruthven, Lethington's chief friend, is wholly theirs, and chief counsellor amongst them. Suspicions do rise on every side, in which I have my part, as of late, because I was at the west Border, and am thought to practice with the Master of Maxwell —I know not what myself. My Lord of Moray was willed not to have to do with me; and when he said 'he could not choose but speak well of me'—'Well,' saith she, [the queen,] 'if you will, let not Argyle have to do with him'—for all that I have supped twice with my Lord of Moray. My Lord of Argyle took the pains to come to my lodging: he brought with him the Lord David. He hath been plain, and, to be short, misliketh all. . . . The country is now so far broken, that there is daily slaughter, without redress, between the Scots and Elliots —stealing at all hands, and justice almost nowhere.

"Now, touching Mr Fowler, [the confidential servant of Lennox,] he came, as I wrote, upon Saturday at night, late. He communed long that night with the queen and his lordship, and brought her grace a letter of five

[1] Pitcairn, vol. i. p. 464.*

or six sheets of paper, all in cipher, from the Lord of Lethington. Thus much is known, that the queen's majesty hath an utter misliking of the matter. What else is contained in the same letter, few, I believe, will come by the knowledge. Part of it was shewn to my Lord of Moray; the rest, at his departure from her grace, was not deciphered. Fowler hath reported that the queen's majesty [Elizabeth] should say openly that she had no liking of the matter, and that if it took effect, then the duke should be put down within one month after, and the good Protestants driven out of the country, which she would not suffer. These words are now in many men's mouths, and many glad to hear it, and believe it the better because that he doth report it.

"Through this, and somewhat else that I have spoken, many are now well satisfied of the queen's majesty that he was not sent hither for any such purpose as now undoubtedly shall take effect. Whatsoever may be borne in hand, that it shall no farther than the queen's majesty's will is, and doth assent to, I know it already past that point. It may be said that my Lord of Moray may be the doer and the contriver thereof, which I know to be otherwise, for if that had been, he would not have refused to have been present at the assurance and contract making. I know much more than this, but I trust this will suffice you for that part.

"What practices are in hand, or how long this matter hath been a brewing, I know not; but this I know hath been said by the father, that he is sure of the greatest part in England, and that the King of Spain will be his friend. If this be their fetch, your honour knoweth what time it is to look about you. How little is to be feared from hence, and what her power is at this time, she standing in such terms as she doth, your honour is not ignorant of.

"It is feared that her majesty [Elizabeth] will over soon allow hereof, and over hastily accord unto this queen's desire; at least, it is wished that there may be some open show of her majesty's discontentment. Lethington is suspected to favour more that way (I mean to my Lord Darnley) than he would seem; and yet, I assure you, he is scarcely trusted amongst them, [Lennox's party,] and of late despiteful words have been spoken against him, upon certain words which he wrote to my Lord Moray, that he should persuade the queen to make no haste in the matter, but keep it in the stay it was when he left it.

"The chief dealers in these matters are David Riccio, the Italian; Mingo, valet-de-chambre; Athole and Ruthven, whom I should have named first.

"Thus your honour seeth our present estate, and how things do frame amongst us. So much pride, such excess in vanities, so proud looks and despiteful words, and so poor a purse I never heard of. My Lord of Lennox is now quite without money; he borrowed five hundred crowns of my Lord of Lethington, and hath scarcely enough now to pay for his horse meat; if he have no more from you, we shall see him presently put to his shifts. His men are bolder and saucier, both with the queen's self and many noblemen, than ever I thought could have been borne: divers of them now resort to the mass, and glory in their doings. Such pride is noted in the father and the son, that there is almost no society or company amongst them. My young lord, lying sick in his bed, hath already boasted the duke to knock his pate when he is whole. . . .

"I write these things with more sorrow and grief of mind than in any passion or affection to any part, [farther] than that I am desirous that the work wherein I have been a labourer, almost six years, with care, sorrow, and greater burden than I have been able to bear, which is to maintain a perfect amity between my native country and this, should not be overthrown and quite destroyed, nor that the good-will which my mistress hath gotten through her deserts amongst

this people, should here take an end when most desired, and most earnestly looked for. Before, she was their friend against foreign nations; now the danger is as great at home. Other refuge they have none—to none more willing to obey, and of her majesty alone they desire support. Counsel is now more worth than men or money. . . . .

"This day [Thursday, 3d May] the chief of the Protestants that at this time are present with the ministers assembled in the Church. Consultation was had what order might be put unto that confusion that had grown up, wherein every man might do and say what he would without reproof against God's glory and His Word. Their deliberations contained three heads. First, how to remove idolatry out of the realm, containing in that as well the queen's chapel as others; next, that her own laws might be put in execution without offence; the third, that liberty might be granted, without inhibition or reproof, to such as are admitted to preach the true Word of God. Long reasoning hath been hereupon. It was determined that the request should be put in writing, and certain appointed as messengers for the rest. More hereof your honour shall know hereafter."[1]

In perusing this letter, we must beware of giving implicit confidence to the representations of Randolph. The picture it conveys of universal discontent, and the symptoms of rising wrath and incipient rebellion which it describes, were coloured highly to suit the purposes of this crafty minister and to favour the views of the English faction. The duke, Moray, and Argyle, with Knox, and all, or the greater portion of the Protestants, were, no doubt, violently opposed to the marriage, and had already adopted precautions, not only for their own defence, but had begun to repeat the same game which they had already played so successfully. They had solicited Randolph to procure for them the support and countenance of the English queen, and had declared their readiness to rise in arms against their sovereign. All this was true; but when this minister asserted that the union with Darnley was odious to the whole nation, when he represented the queen as having fallen into universal contempt, and when he described the lives of the Protestant preachers as being in danger from the measures adopted against them, he stated what was contradicted by subsequent events, and even disproved by his own letters. It was soon seen that Mary, if she had some enemies, had also many powerful friends. Besides Lennox and his son, now restored to their estates and, with their lands, to great feudal strength, she could reckon firmly on the support of the Earls of Athole and Caithness, the Lords Hume and Ruthven, with the Lord Robert, and all the ancient barons and families who were still secretly attached to the Catholic religion.[2] It was surmised, also, that Lethington, whose counsel and experience were of such value to any party which he cordially embraced, would be unwilling to declare openly against her; and the mind of the queen herself, far from being overwhelmed by the difficulties which surrounded her, seemed to gain energy by the struggle, and led her to act with a promptitude, spirit, and vigour for which her opponents were not prepared.

Before, however, she proceeded to more decisive measures, she resolved to make a last attempt to gain Moray, and obtain his consent to her marriage with Darnley. He was flattered and caressed, both by the queen and the Earl of Lennox, but to little effect. Mary then seizing a moment when he was off his guard, and in Lord Darnley's chamber, took him aside and placed a paper in his hands, to which she required him to put his name. It contained an approval of her marriage, and an engagement to promote it with his whole power; and this she insisted he should consent to, as he would shew himself her faithful subject, and avoid her displeasure. Moray firmly,

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 3d May 1565.

[2] Keith, p. 272.

but respectfully declined. "Her resolution," he said, "was over-hasty, and her demand upon him too sudden and peremptory. What would foreign princes think of such precipitation? What must be the opinion of the Queen of England, with whom her ambassador was even then in treaty, and whose answer she daily expected? But most of all," he said, "he would be loath to consent to the marriage of any one of whom there was so little hope that he would be a favourer of Christ's true religion, which was the thing most to be desired: of one who hitherto had shewn himself rather an enemy than a preserver of the same."[1] Indignant and surprised at this refusal, Mary remonstrated, entreated, and even threatened: but all was to no purpose. To her "many sore words," he replied with great calmness and humility, yet he continued firm in his resolution, and was dismissed from the presence of his sovereign with a bitter accusation of ingratitude, and expressions of her high resentment.

This interview occurred on the 8th of May, and the queen summoned a convention of her nobility to meet at Stirling on the 15th of the same month. Her object was to obtain their consent to her marriage previous to the return of Lethington with the answer of Elizabeth; and to accomplish this, she despatched Beaton, a gentleman in whom she had much confidence, with new instructions to be delivered to her secretary. They were drawn up in terms very different from his first commission. Mary commanded him to return to the Queen of England, and declare unto her, that, since she had been so long trained with fair speeches, and in the end beguiled of her expectation, she had now resolved, with the advice of the estates of her realm, to use her own choice in her marriage, and to select such a one as in her opinion should be most worthy of the honour to which he was to be raised. The letter which contained these instructions was written wholly by herself. "It wanted," says Throckmorton, who had seen the original, "neither eloquence, despite, anger, love, nor passion,"[2] and was evidently dictated by a keen feeling of the ingratitude, duplicity, and selfishness with which she had been treated by Elizabeth. He was also directed, after he had finished his negotiation in England, to pass over to France, and use his influence there to procure from the French king and that court an approval of her choice. To induce her secretary to enter cordially into her views, Mary at the same time wrote to him with her own hand "the most favourable and gentle letter that ever queen did address to her servant." She sent him also a bill of credit, on the receivers of her dowry in France, empowering him to draw for any sum he pleased, and, in the event of his success in this mission, promised him the highest preferment which it was in her power to bestow.[3]

Before, however, her messenger could reach London, Lethington had left that city on his return, and Elizabeth had despatched Sir Nicholas Throckmorton (her late ambassador in France) on a mission to Scotland. He was instructed to communicate to the Scottish queen the resolution of the English Privy-council, to notify her entire disapproval of her union with Darnley, and to take measures to prevent its precipitate consummation. When on the way to the English court, Beaton encountered Lethington near Newark, and communicated his message to the Scottish secretary. Nothing can more strikingly shew the treachery of Mary's ministers, and the entire licence they assumed of disobeying, when it was convenient for them, the commands of their sovereign, than Lethington's conduct on this occasion. He heard the message, received the queen's letters, put them in his pocket, refused alike to return to London or to pass into France, and posting forward with all speed, overtook Throckmorton at Alnwick. Here he basely communicated to him the secret in-

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 8th May 1565.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Throckmorton to Cecil and Leicester, 11th May 1565.

[3] Ibid.

structions he had received, and breaking into expressions of extreme rage and indignation towards his royal mistress, regretted that the English ambassador was not empowered to denounce war against her in case she resolved to proceed in this marriage with those whom he denominated the rebels of the English queen.[1] The two ambassadors then pursued their journey towards Scotland in company. "He was enjoined," said Throckmorton, (speaking of Lethington, and writing to Leicester and Cecil,) "to stay me, that I should not come into Scotland, and contrary to that, he will not go without me."[2] Are we to wonder that, when Mary's affairs were managed by such men, she was anxious to change her counsellors, and to seek for fidelity in another faction.

In the meantime the convention of the nobility which had been summoned to deliberate upon the marriage assembled at Stirling on the 15th May. It was most numerously attended, and included, with the exception of Lord Ochiltree, and a few others, the whole of the most influential nobles in the kingdom. There were present the duke, with the Earls of Argyle, Moray, Morton, Glencairn, Athole, Crawford, Eglinton, Cassillis, Rothes, and Caithness. The Lords Hume, Gray, Glammis, Borthwick, Yester, Fleming, Livingston, Semple, Ross, Lindsay, Lovat, Boyd, and Somerville. Besides these, there were the Officers of State, including the Secretary, the Justice-clerk, the Treasurer, and the Advocate, with the Commendators[3] of Holyrood, Kilwinning, Jedburgh, St Colm's Inch, and Balmerinoch.[4] At this solemn assembly of her nobles, the queen announced her intention of marrying Darnley, and the measure was approved of without a dissentient voice. Moray and his faction, whose real sentiments were strongly hostile to such a proceeding, appear to have been overawed into a temporary consent, whilst the great majority of her barons admitted its expediency, and advised that it should be carried into effect.[5] Thus confirmed in her purpose, Mary on the same day conferred the honour of knighthood upon Darnley, and immediately after created him Lord of Ardmanach and Earl of Ross. He then took the oaths, was girt with the sword, and, on rising from his knees before the queen, himself bestowed the dignity of knighthood upon fourteen gentlemen of ancient and loyal families who knelt before the throne.[6] In the midst of these proceedings, word was brought that Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, ambassador of the queen of England, was then at the gate of the castle, and urgently demanded an audience. On being admitted, he delivered in strong language the remonstrance of his royal mistress: he expressed her surprise at the unadvised proceedings of the Scottish queen; and complained loudly of the presumption of Lennox and Darnley, her own subjects, who, without giving her any previous notice, had dared to engage in such an enterprise. To this Mary replied with great calmness and dignity. She said, "That as soon as she had formed her resolution on the subject of her marriage, she had communicated her intentions to Elizabeth, which was all that she had ever promised to do. As to her good sister's great dislike to the match," she observed sarcastically, "that this was indeed a marvellous circumstance, since the selection was made in conformity to the queen's wishes, as communicated by Mr Randolph. She had rejected all foreign suitors, and had chosen an Englishman, descended from the blood-royal of both kingdoms, and the first prince of the blood in England; and one whom she believed would, for these reasons, be acceptable to the subjects of both realms."[7]

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Throckmorton to Cecil and Leicester, 11th May 1565. [2] Ibid.

[3] A commendator was any clergyman who held a vacant benefice till it was provided with a sufficient pastor.

[4] Keith, p. 277.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 11th May 1565.

[6] Keith, pp. 276, 280, inclusive. Also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 21st May 1565.

[7] Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 21st May 1565, printed in Keith, p. 278.

It was difficult for the ambassador to answer this temperate remonstrance, which he knew to be founded in truth; and as the queen treated him with much courtesy, and agreed to postpone the ceremony of creating Darnley Duke of Albany till she heard again from Elizabeth, he judged it right neither to push matters to an extremity nor to hold out any encouragement to her discontented nobles.

The English queen, however, resorting to severer and more decided measures, ordered Lady Lennox into custody, having suspected her of intriguing with the Earl of Northumberland, and other leaders of the papists in England. At the same time, she again (12th June 1565) submitted to her Privy-council the question of the marriage of the Scottish queen. Their decision, as it is preserved in the original draft by Cecil, is of much importance in the light it throws on the state of parties in England. Two questions were propounded to the council:—1st, What perils might ensue to the queen's majesty and her realm upon the marriage of the Queen of Scotland with Lord Darnley? 2d, What was meet to be done to avoid the same? "The perils," says Cecil in his minute of what took place, "being sundry and very many, were reduced by some councillors to only two:—1st, That by this marriage, the queen's majesty being unmarried, a great number in this realm, not of the worst subjects, might be alienated in their minds from their natural duties to her majesty, to depend upon the success of this marriage of Scotland as a mean to establish the succession of both the crowns in the issue of the same marriage, and to favour all devices and practices that should tend to the advancement of the Queen of Scots."

"Under the second peril it was observed, that, considering the chief foundation of that [party] which favoured the marriage with the Lord Darnley was laid upon the trust of such as were papists, as the only mean left to restore the religion of Rome, it was plainly to be seen that, both in this realm and in Scotland, the papists would most favour, maintain, and fortify the marriage of the Lord Darnley; and would, for furtherance of their faction in religion, devise all means and practices that could be within this realm to disturb the estate of the queen's majesty and the peace of the realm, and consequently to achieve their purpose by force rather than fail."

The paper proceeds to point out, by way of warning to Elizabeth, that when Mary's power was the greatest—namely, during her marriage with the dauphin—she evinced her real mind to dispossess that princess of her title, both by assuming the style and arms of England, and by troops sent into Scotland to accomplish her ambitious purposes. It then proceeds in these remarkable words:—"It is also to be remembered, that seeing now, before this attempt of marriage, it was found and manifestly seen, that in every corner of the realm the faction that most favoureth the Scottish title is grown stout and bold, yea, seen manifestly in this court, both in hall and chamber, it could not be but (except good heed were speedily given to it) the same faction would speedily increase by this marriage, and by the practice of the fautor [author] thereof, and grow so great and dangerous, as the redress thereof would be almost desperate. And to this purpose it was to be remembered how, of late, in perusing of the substance of the Justices of Peace in all the counties of the realm, *scantly a third part was found fully assured to be trusted in the matter of religion*, upon which only string the Queen of Scots' title doth hang; and some doubts might be that the friends of the Earl of Lennox had more knowledge of this than was meet, and thereby made their vaunt now in Scotland that their party was so great in England that the queen's majesty dared not attempt to oppose the marriage." In this sort was the sum of the perils declared.

Upon the second question, What was best to be done to avoid these dangers? it was determined, that the first way

was to obtain that the queen's majesty would marry, and hold them with no long delay. Secondly, that measures should be taken to advance and fortify the profession of religion, both in Scotland and in England. Third, that proceedings should be commenced, either altogether to break off this intended marriage, or at least to procure the same not to be so hurtful to the realm as otherwise it might be; and lastly, that some intelligence should be used in Scotland with the party opposed to the marriage, and comfort given them from time to time.[1]

It will be seen from this authentic paper that the apprehensions entertained regarding the effects of this union with Darnley upon the Popish faction in England (which was far stronger than is generally believed) were not altogether ideal. There seem to have been two parties amongst the English Protestants, who viewed the match with different feelings. Elizabeth herself, with the Earl of Leicester, and the powerful anti-Cecilian faction which supported him, were suspected to regard the marriage with no great dislike, although for the moment she judged it prudent to dissemble, and to appear deeply offended. It delivered the English queen from the fear that Mary should make some potent foreign alliance—with Austria or Spain—and it kept at court her favourite Leicester. These sentiments, too, were well known at the Scottish court, and Randolph was repeatedly met by the observation that the resentment of his royal mistress was mere dissimulation.[2] But the other party were more sincere and determined in their opposition. Cecil, Bedford, and Randolph had deeply intrigued with Scotland; they believed that the overthrow of their friends, the Earls of Moray, Argyle, and Lethington, would put an end to English influence in that country; they dreaded lest Lennox and Darnley might in time be won over by the queen to re-establish the Romish faith, which it was known they secretly professed, and they adopted every means to thwart the designs of the Scottish queen. Nor were these means of the purest or most upright kind: as long as Mary, deceived and drawn on by the protestations and duplicity of Elizabeth, placed herself under the guidance of this princess, she was represented in the letters of Randolph as amiable, truthful, affectionate, and popular. The Protestants were described as contented, excepting only the most violent, whose conduct this envoy repeatedly censures; and, (which is very remarkable,) not a year before this, both Moray and Lethington had assured the Queen of England that the conduct of their royal mistress in respect to the reformed religion entitled her to high praise: its foundation, they said, was perfectly secure; whilst they enjoyed liberty of conscience, and the favour of their prince, as abundantly as heart could wish.[3] From that moment to the present not a step had been taken by the Queen of Scotland which could create suspicion in any reasonable mind that she meditated aught against the national religion. On the contrary, the Catholic party had been treated with undue severity; the private exercise of her religion had been threatened to be abridged; the sanctity of her chapel and her palace invaded; and the laws against the mass carried into the strictest execution, even where the offenders were of the highest rank in the Church. These were all facts with which Randolph, the English minister, was perfectly familiar, and which can be proved from his own letters. Yet, no sooner did Mary fix her choice on Darnley, no sooner did it become apparent to Moray that his power was on the wane, and to Randolph that the English faction in Scotland was likely to lose ground, and to be superseded in their authority, than the letters of

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, original draft by Cecil, June 4, 1565.

[2] Throckmorton to Sir William Cecil, 21st May 1565, printed in Keith, p. 280. Also, Randolph to Cecil, 2d July, printed in Keith, p. 288. Also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 15th April 1565. Ibid., same to same, 29th April 1565.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Moray to Cecil, 13th July 1564.

this pliant envoy abounded with complaints and misrepresentations. The reformed religion was described as not only in danger, but already ruined, and the godly undone; the queen was said to be fallen into universal contempt; we are told that her whole character had altered within a few days, that even her countenance and beauty were decayed, so that many thought she was bewitched; and lastly, that an irresistible party had resolved to oppose the marriage and avert the ruin of their country.

The events which now occurred, and the conduct respectively pursued by Mary, the Protestants, and Elizabeth, proved these statements to be exaggerated and unfounded. The measures of the Scottish queen, under an irritating opposition, were temperate and conciliating. She sent Hay, her Master of Requests, a prudent and able man, a favourer of Moray, and a friend of Randolph, on a mission to the English queen. He was to labour not only to reconcile Elizabeth to her union with Darnley, but to state her anxiety to preserve peace, her resolution to postpone her marriage for a short time, and her desire that there should be a meeting of commissioners from both countries, to deliberate on the best means of composing the differences which had occurred.[1] On the other hand, the Protestants, led by Moray and Argyle, attempted to overawe their sovereign; they solicited earnestly the assistance of the English queen, and debated among themselves whether it would be best to assassinate Darnley, or to seize him and his father, and deliver them up to England. Some time before the mission of Hay, Randolph, describing the pride and passionate temper of this young favourite, thus writes to Cecil:—"Her [Mary's] councillors are now those whom she liked worst, the nearest of her kin, the farthest from her heart. My Lord of Moray liveth where he lists. My Lord of Lethington hath now both leave and time enough to make court unto his mistress.[2] . . David is he that now worketh all, chief secretary to the queen, and only governor to her good man; the bruits here are wonderful—men talk very strange—the hazard towards him and his house marvellous great; his pride intolerable, his words not to be borne, but where no man dare speak again. He spareth not also, in token of his manhood, to let some blows fly where he knoweth that they will be taken. Such passions, such furies, as I hear say, that sometimes he will be in, is strange to believe. What cause this people hath to rejoice of this their worthy prince, I leave it to the world to think. When they have said all, and thought what they can, they find nothing but that God must send him a short end, or themselves a miserable life, to live under such estate and government as this is like to be! What comfort can they look for at the queen's majesty's hands, or what support if aught should be attempted, seeing the most part are persuaded that to this end he was sent into this country. I spare here to speak so much as I have heard; and knowing so little of the queen's mind as I do, I know not what counsel or advice to give." . . . The letter then alludes to the great hazard of Moray and his party in these remarkable words:—"To see so many in hazard, as now stand in danger of life, land, and goods, it is great pity to think—only to remedy this mischief, he [Darnley] must be taken away, or such as he hateth find such support, that whatsoever he intendeth to another may light upon himself. A little now spent in the beginning yieldeth double fruit. What were it for the queen's majesty, if she list not to do it by force, with the expense of three or four thousand pounds to do with this country what she would?"[3]

[1] Keith, p. 283. Instructions to Mr J. Hay. Also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 12th June 1565. Ibid., Mary to Elizabeth, St Johnston, 15th June 1565.

[2] Keith, p. 283. Instructions to Mr J. Hay. Also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 12th June 1565. Ibid., Mary to Elizabeth, St Johnston, 15th June 1565.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Leicester, 3d June 1565.

The proceedings of Elizabeth were at this moment marked by that duplicity and desire to embroil Mary with her own subjects which had all along characterised them. She had already placed the Countess of Lennox under restraint, but she now committed her to the Tower, a severity which could not fail to encourage Moray and his friends.[1] She sent a summons to the Earl of Lennox and his son Lord Darnley, commanding them, on their allegiance as English subjects, instantly to repair to her court.[2] Not long after, she addressed a letter to the Scottish queen, declaring her entire disapproval of her proceedings; and she instructed Randolph not only directly to communicate with Moray's faction, but to assure them that she would support them against the malice of their enemies as long as their efforts were directed to maintain the religion, and to preserve the amity between the two kingdoms.[3]

Nothing upon the part of Moray could be more futile and unfounded than the pretence that the Protestant religion was in danger, or that the queen at this moment had adopted any measures which threatened its security. It is happy for the truth that on such a point we have the declaration of Moray and Lethington themselves. On the 13th of July 1564, they stated to Cecil that the presence of Lennox in Scotland, even if he should be fortunate enough to ally himself with the most powerful person in the state, would be totally ineffectual to shake the national religion from that firm foundation on which it rested.[4] These declarations, indeed, were made a year before this; but during the course of that year not only had the Scottish queen introduced no one measure which could by any ingenuity be deemed an attack upon the national religion, but she had shewn the most decided determination to support it as the religion of the state, and to enforce the cruel and unjust laws against those who adhered to the public exercise of a contrary faith. It is evident, therefore, that the Earl of Moray and the party of the nobles who opposed the marriage had raised the cry of "danger to the Church" merely to cover their own designs.

The same remark does not apply to Knox, who, after his long estrangement from Moray, now once more acted in concert with him. To the stern uncompromising mind of this reformer the mass was idolatry; so long as it maintained its place in the queen's private chapel, he believed that the Protestant faith was in danger, and that in permitting its use the preachers and the people committed a deadly sin. Moray had always contended for the right of the queen to have the private exercise of her religion: Knox had as obstinately denied it. He contended that, by the Word of God, and the laws of the land, every priest who dared to celebrate, and every person who ventured to attend, the mass was obnoxious to capital punishment; and he evidently considered that the sufferance of the "idol," as he named it, under any circumstances, was a direct infringement upon the rights and the security of the national religion. He is to be judged therefore by a different standard from that which must be applied to his ambitious and potent ally. Moray was the slave of private ambition: his paramount desire evidently was to retain the great power which he possessed, and in his efforts to effect this he repeated the same game which ambition has so often played: he masked his selfish projects under a zeal for religion. Knox, on the other hand, however fierce, dictatorial, and even unscrupulous as to means, was perfectly honest. No Church plunder can be traced to his hands; no pensions from England or France secured his services; nor is there the slightest evidence (at least I have discovered

[1] Mr Stevenson's Illustrations of the Reign of Queen Mary, p. 140.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Queen Elizabeth to Queen Mary, 18th June 1565. (A Copy.)

[3] The Queen of England to Randolph, 10th July 1565. Printed by Keith, p. 296.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 13th July 1564. Also, Ibid., Moray to Cecil, same date.

none) that at any time he pursued a scheme of personal aggrandisement separate from that spiritual authority which attached itself to him as the great leader of the Reformation. His character was great, irregular, and imperfect: his views were often erroneous. In his mind many subjects assumed an undue importance and magnitude; whilst others, especially those connected with the practical influence of the gospel upon the heart and conduct, were often neglected or forgotten. But in his public career he was consistent, fearless, sincere; the single object to which he devoted himself was to establish on a sure foundation what he believed to be the only true faith—the only form of worship consistent with the declarations of Scripture and the glory of God. It is needless to point out to what a height this raises him above Moray, Argyle, Lethington, and the crowd of venal barons by whom he was surrounded.

Mary had summoned a convention of her nobility to be held at St Johnston on the 22d of June.[1] It was her intention in this assembly to procure their final consent to her union with Darnley, and to fix the period of her marriage. Instead of obeying her wishes, the discontented barons vigorously exerted themselves to traverse all her schemes. Moray refused to come to Perth, alleging that his life was in danger from a conspiracy formed by Darnley; Argyle, in concert with Knox and the preachers, appointed the General Assembly of the Church to be held at Edinburgh whilst the convention was sitting at Perth. There seems to be no doubt that the faction of Moray and the party of Knox now acted in concert; and the reformer, who possessed great influence with the people, bestirred himself so successfully against the queen, that, in a convocation of the citizens, held in the fields near Edinburgh, it was resolved to arm and organise the burgesses, to choose captains, and to seize the weapons of such as were believed favourable to the marriage. At the same time, after lengthened debates, the General Assembly drew up a supplication to their sovereign.[2] It requested that the blasphemous mass and all popish idolatry should be abolished, not only throughout the kingdom, but also in her royal person and household; that true religion, as it is founded on the Word of God, should be professed as well by herself as by her subjects, and that it should be made obligatory upon all persons to resort to the preaching of the Word, and to prayers, if not every day, at least every Sunday. It proposed that some sure provision should be made for the support of the ministers of the gospel; that pluralities should be abolished; a strict examination instituted into the appointment of all teachers of youth in schools and colleges; a fund set apart for the maintenance of the poor, out of those lands which of old were destined to hospitality, and some relief devised for the poor labourers of the soil, who were oppressed in the payment of their tithes by unreasonable and illegal exactions.[3]

This petition was intrusted to the Earl of Glencairn, with five commissioners, who repaired to Perth, (1st July 1565,) and presented it to the queen. Her conduct at this crisis is entitled to much praise. She was alarmed by the accounts of the hostile and tumultuous assembly of the citizens in Edinburgh, and when she read the demands of the Church it was evident that they approached indefinitely near to the compelling herself, and all who adhered to the Catholic faith, to renounce what they believed to be true, and embrace what they were persuaded was false. Yet her answer was temperate and conciliatory. She declared that it was impossible for her to renounce the mass herself, or to abolish it in her household, not being yet persuaded that there was any impiety in this great service of the Church. She reminded the commissioners how completely

[1] Letter, Randolph to Cecil, in Keith, p. 387, 2d July 1565.

[2] Spottiswood, p. 190.

[3] Ibid.

liberty of conscience, since her arrival in her dominions, had been permitted to all her subjects, and she expected in return, she said, "the same liberty to be granted to herself. As for the establishment of religion in the body of the realm, she declared that she was ready to abide by the decision of the three estates of parliament, as soon as they were convened, and to whom alone, as they were well aware, the determination of so important a question belonged."[1]

A more gentle and reasonable reply to an extravagant demand could hardly have been given; but the discontented lords were still unsatisfied: they were undone if the queen was left to follow her own wishes, and the marriage went forward; and, acting under this conviction, they resolved either to compel her to submit to their dictation, or to put it out of her power to carry her designs into effect. With this purpose, Moray, Argyle, and Lord Boyd held a secret meeting at Lochleven,[2] and from thence sent a confidential messenger to communicate their designs to Randolph, and to understand from him whether Elizabeth would receive Lennox and Darnley if they were seized, and sent prisoners to Berwick. The ambassador answered, that the queen his mistress would receive her own subjects "in what sort soever they came;" and thus encouraged, these daring men formed a plot to attack the Scottish queen as she rode, with Darnley in her company, from Perth to Callander, a seat of Lord Livingston's. The route to be travelled afforded two favourable situations for such a surprise; the one a wild narrow defile near Perth, called the pass of Dron,[3] the other a tract of broken and difficult ground near Beith, some miles north of the Queensferry. It was intended, according to Randolph's account, to have carried Mary to St Andrews, and Darnley to castle Campbell; but these were only preliminary steps: Moray's ultimate object (if we may believe the assertion of a brother conspirator) was to murder Darnley, seize the government, and imprison the queen for life in Lochleven.[4]

This traitorous plot was signally defeated by the courage and celerity of Mary's movements. Having received some hint of her danger, she commanded Athole and Ruthven to assemble their followers, and leaving Perth with an escort of three hundred horse in the dawn of the morning, traversed the country with the utmost speed, passed Lochleven and Kinross without drawing bridle, pushed on to the ferry, and crossing the Firth, reached Callander House in safety. Two hours after she passed Argyle appeared at Kinross, but the prey had escaped him; and their treacherous enterprise becoming publicly known, excited the utmost indignation in the country.[5] Disappointed in this attempt, Moray and his associates made a last endeavour to rouse the people. They resumed in a still louder tone the cry that the queen was determined to overthrow religion, to break the amity which had of late united them to England, and to commence anew her persecution of the brethren. They implored the assistance and support of Elizabeth; assured her that Bothwell, the mortal enemy of English influence, had been sent for; besought her to let loose "some strapping Elliots" upon Lord Hume, Mary's great partisan, on the marches towards Lothian, who might keep his hands full at home; and attempted to rouse her jealousy by spreading rumours of an intercourse with France and Rome.[6] But from neither quarter did they receive much sympathy or encouragement; Elizabeth fed them with empty promises, the people grew lukewarm

[1] Spottiswood, p. 190. Keith, p. 289. Randolph to Cecil, 2d July 1565.

[2] Mr Stevenson's Illustrations of the Reign of Mary, p. 118. Argyle and Moray to Randolph, 1st July 1565.

[3] Knox, p. 412.

[4] Randolph to Cecil, 4th July 1565, in Keith, p. 291. Also, "Instructions and Articles addressed to the Commissioners of the Queen of Scots, 12th September 1568." Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 358, 359.

[5] Randolph to Cecil, in Keith, p. 291. Melvil's Memoirs, p. 135.

[6] Randolph to Cecil, 4th July 1565. Keith, pp. 294, 295.

or suspicious: They were aware of no act upon the part of the queen which manifested hostility to their religion; on the contrary, when at Callander, she had for the first time in her life attended the Protestant sermon. She declared her readiness to hear Erskine of Dun, one of the leading reformers, but a man of a mild and peaceable disposition, in his exposition of the errors of the Church of Rome; and she hastened, by a solemn proclamation, to assure her subjects that no alteration was meditated in the national religion; that the same liberty of conscience which, since her arrival in her dominions, had been enjoyed by all classes of her people should still be maintained in its fullest sense.[1]

At the same time, Mary exerted herself with uncommon vigour against the insurgent lords. As Argyle, her great enemy, and the most powerful ally of Moray, had collected his vassals, and was about to attack Athole—a nobleman who strenuously supported her—she despatched Lethington and the Justice-Clerk to arrest hostilities, and commanded them in her name to disband their forces.[2] Aware that a convocation of Moray's adherents was to be held at Glasgow, she sent a herald to that city to forbid all such illegal assemblies, under pain of treason;[3] and at the same time she prorogued the meeting of the three estates from July till September, justly thinking that it would have been vain and premature to attempt to hold a calm legislative assembly whilst a powerful faction, assisted and stimulated by the intrigues of England, were plotting to raise a civil war, and seemed not unlikely to succeed. But her last measure was the most decisive of all. She summoned her subjects to meet her instantly in arms in the capital, with fifteen days' provision, that she might proceed against her enemies.[4]

Yet, whilst Mary felt herself compelled to adopt these severe proceedings against her insurgent barons, she made a final effort to reclaim Moray, the head of the revolt. He had refused to attend the convention at Stirling, alleging that his life was in danger from a conspiracy of Lennox and Darnley. These noblemen indignantly repelled the charge; and the Scottish queen, anxious to do justice to both parties, summoned him to appear, and make good his accusation. Lest he should plead that his obedience to her commands might expose him to the attacks of his enemies, she sent him her letters of safe-conduct.[5] This passport extended protection not only to him, but to eighty attendants—no insufficient body-guard certainly; and to prevent all possibility of cavil, it was signed, not by the queen alone, but by all her Privy-council. At the same time Darnley transmitted a friendly message; and Lennox, for himself and his son, not only disclaimed the base designs imputed to them, but besought him to give up his informer, and offered to fight any one who dared avow the slander.[6] This peremptory summons Moray did not think proper to obey, and his refusal was favourable to the cause of the queen. It warned Mary that nothing but open force could reduce her opponents; and it convinced many who were wavering that the alleged conspiracy was an invention of his own, equally unfounded with the alarm regarding the overthrow of the Protestant religion, and got up for the same purpose, of veiling his attempt for the recovery of the power which he had lost.

Meanwhile he had no mean assistant in Randolph. The character of this crafty agent of Cecil was of that accommodating and equivocal kind which, without loving misrepresentation (to use a mild word) for its own sake, did not hesitate to employ it

1 MS. Privy-council Book, p. 73. It is printed in Keith, Appendix, pp. 106, 107.

2 MS. Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland, under July 6, 1565.

3 Ibid., under July 12, 1565.

4 Keith, p. 298. She at the same time addressed close letters to the principal nobles and gentry of her kingdom, requiring their instant attendance. Keith, p. 299.

5 Keith, p. 108, Appendix; Assurance to the Earl of Moray. Also, p. 110, Appendix.

6 Keith, p. 302.

when he thought it would forward the designs of his royal mistress, or of her principal minister. As long as all went smoothly in Scotland, as long as the queen, deceived by the promises of Elizabeth, and acting under the guidance of Moray, was willing to consult the wishes of her royal sister, the letters of Randolph convey to us a pretty fair picture of the conduct of Mary and the progress of events; but as soon as she began to act for herself —as soon as her brother, the friend of England, was stript of his power and lost his influence, this minister transmitted to Cecil, and to the English queen, the most false and distorted accounts of the state of the country. His object was to induce Elizabeth to assist the insurgent lords with money and troops, as she had already done in the war of the Reformation; and to accomplish this end, he not only concealed the truth, but did not scruple to employ calumny and falsehood. He represented Mary's proceedings to her nobles as tyrannical, when they were forbearing; he described her as earnestly bent on the destruction of religion, when for five years she had maintained it exactly as she found it on her arrival, and had recently, by a solemn proclamation, declared her determination to preserve the fullest liberty of conscience; he painted her as an object of contempt to her subjects, when she was popular and beloved; and as deserted by her nobles and her people, when, in consequence of the late summons, her barons and vassals were daily crowding into the capital.[1] On the other hand, Moray and his faction were equally falsely depicted as so strong that the country lay at their mercy, whilst they waited only for the advice and the money of England to sweep away every opposition, and compel the queen to place herself once more at their disposal. These accounts, however, made little impression upon the English queen, and it is probable that she was aware of their being inconsistent with the truth. She directed her ambassador, however, to intercede for Moray; but the application, as might have been expected, met with no success. Mary thanked her good sister for her advice, but lamented that she should be so entirely misinformed. "Those," said she to Randolph, "whom your mistress calls my best subjects I can never account so, as they resist my authority; and the queen must not be offended if I pursue the remedy which I have in my own hands.[2] The ambassador then addressed himself to Lennox and Darnley, reminding them of Elizabeth's peremptory order for their repair into England, and charging them, as her subjects, to obey it; but he met with a decided refusal: from the father in terms of respect, from the son in so proud and insolent a tone that Randolph turned his back upon him, and they parted in contempt and anger.[3]

In the midst of these transactions, the insurgent lords became daily convinced that, if not speedily supported by England, their struggle must be brought to a calamitous termination. Every hour added to the strength of the queen; her solemn public assurances that no alteration was meditated in the national religion; her successful detection of the interested schemes and false representations of her enemies; the vigour and decision with which she acted, and the anxiety she evinced to preserve amity with Elizabeth, although irritated by the constant misrepresentations and seditious intrigues of Randolph,—all these circumstances produced the most favourable effect, and convinced the great body of her subjects that Moray, and the faction which opposed her measures, were actuated by no other motive than selfishness and ambition.

It was now the end of July, and Chisholm, bishop of Dunblane, having

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, July 7, 1565. Also, Keith, p. 301. Randolph to Cecil, 19th July 1565. Again in Keith, p. 287, Randolph to Cecil, 2d July 1565. Again in Keith, p. 304, Randolph to Cecil, 21st July 1565. And MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to the Queen, 23d July 1565.

[2] Keith, p. 303, Randolph to Cecil, 21st July 1565.

[3] Keith, p. 304.

arrived from Rome with a dispensation for the marriage, it was intimated to the people, by a public proclamation, that the queen had resolved to take to her husband an illustrious prince, Henry, Duke of Albany, for which reason she commanded her subjects henceforth to give him the title of king. Next day, being Sunday, the 29th of July, the ceremony was performed in the royal chapel of Holyrood, at six in the morning. Mary was habited in deep mourning, and it was superstitiously observed that it was the same dress which she wore on the melancholy day of her late husband's obsequies. After the solemnity, and when the youthful pair had risen from the altar, Darnley embraced and kissed the bride, and, retiring from the chapel, left her to hear mass alone, surrounded only by those nobles who adhered to the ancient faith. On the conclusion of the service, being conducted back to her chamber, she consented, at the earnest entreaty of her husband, to renounce her weeds, and assume a costume more suited to the happiness of the day. The banquet succeeded, in which the queen was served by the Earl of Athole as sewer, Morton as carver, and Crawford as cup-bearer. The king, sitting beside her, was waited on by the Earls of Eglinton, Cassillis, and Glencairn. Money in abundance was scattered among the guests, the hall rang with music and cries of "largess," and the evening closed with the dances and joyous revelry which generally accompany such regal festivals.[1] Mary was then in her twenty-third, and Darnley had probably just completed his nineteenth year.

CHAPTER VII.

MARY.

1565—1567.

PREVIOUS to her marriage with Darnley, Mary had become assured that Moray and his faction were ready to rise in rebellion against her government if they met with the least encouragement from England; after this event, every day convinced her that Randolph, the English ambassador, was using all his efforts to induce her barons to throw off their allegiance, and that Elizabeth not only approved of their proceedings, but secretly stimulated them to revolt.[2]

To prepare for this emergency, the Scottish queen summoned her subjects to meet her in arms in the capital.[3] Her safety lay in promptitude and decision; she resolved to anticipate the movements of her opponents before it was possible for them to receive succour from England; and in this her efforts were eminently successful. Three days after her marriage, Moray was commanded to appear at court under the penalty of being proclaimed a rebel; and having failed, he was "put to the horn," as it was termed—that is, his

[1] Randolph to Leicester, July 31; in Robertson's Appendix, No. xi. This noted letter, which had been printed by Robertson, has been printed, as if for the first time, by Von Raumer. Also Keith, p. 307. Chalmers's Life of Mary, vol. ii. p. 127.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Earl of Moray to Cecil, Carlisle, Oct. 14, 1565. [I may here observe where the words *MS. letter* occur, the reader may consider the letter to be an original. When I quote a copy, the word *copy* is subjoined.]

[3] MS. Proclamation, State-paper Office, July 16, 1565. Copy of the time endorsed by Randolph.

life and estates were declared forfeited to the laws: upon which Randolph, in a letter addressed to the Queen of England, implored her to strengthen the hands of the English party in Scotland, and to save them from utter ruin.[1] He wrote also to the Earl of Bedford, an old and tried friend of Moray's, urging him to use his influence to procure instant assistance, and assuring him that if the English Borderers could be let loose at this crisis, so as to keep their Scottish neighbours employed, the queen and Darnley would be reduced to great distress.[2] His letters to Elizabeth contained an alarming picture of affairs in Scotland. He represented religion, by which he meant Protestantism, as in danger; and affirmed that the amity between the two kingdoms was on the point of being broken But the English queen was slow to credit all his statements, and contented herself with despatching Mr Tamworth, one of the gentlemen of her bedchamber, to the Scottish court, with the vain object of accomplishing a reconciliation between Mary and the Earl of Moray.[3]

This, however, was now impossible. The Scottish queen, convinced that Moray's sole purpose was to recover the power which he had lost, allowed her enemies no time to concentrate their strength, but at the head of a force which defied opposition compelled them to fly from Stirling to Glasgow, and from Glasgow to Argyle.[4] She then returned to Edinburgh, where Tamworth had arrived; and this envoy being admitted to an audience, was received by Mary with a spirit for which he seems not to have been prepared.[5]

In the letter which Elizabeth sent to this princess she had affected to treat with contempt her pretensions to the English throne, and her practices with foreign powers; but Mary could express herself as severely, though with greater command of temper than her sister of England. After defending her marriage, and remonstrating against the uncalled-for interference of Elizabeth, she turned to the subject of the succession. "I am not," said she, "so lowly born, nor yet have I such small alliances abroad, that if compelled by your mistress to enter into 'practices' with foreign powers, she shall find them of such small account as she believes. The place which I fill in relation to the succession to the crown of England is no vain or imaginary one, and by God's grace it shall appear to the world that my designs and consultations shall prove as substantial as those which at any time my neighbours have taken in hand."[6]

But although she repelled Elizabeth's haughty and sarcastic insinuations, Mary was sincerely desirous of peace. To promote this, she promised Randolph all that could justly be required. She could not consent indeed to renounce her title to a throne to which she held her claim to be undoubted, but she was ready to come under the most solemn obligation that neither she nor her husband should attempt anything to the prejudice of the English queen or of her issue, and that whenever God called them to the possession of their right in England, no alteration should be made in the religion, laws, or liberties of that ancient kingdom. In return, she insisted on the performance of two conditions: the first, that Elizabeth, by act of parliament, should settle the English crown upon herself and Darnley, in the first instance, and, in default of them and their children, on the Lady Margaret, countess of Lennox; the

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to the Queen. [When in the notes I use the words *to the Queen*, in quoting any letter, the Queen of England is meant.] 23d July 1565, Edinburgh.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Bedford, Edinburgh, 24th July 1565.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Tamworth and Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, 10th August 1565.

[4] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 82. Keith, p. 316. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Mary to the Master of Maxwell, copy, Edinburgh, 23d August 1565.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Tamworth and Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, 10th August 1565.

[6] MS. State-paper Office, Answers given by the Queen of Scots to "Articles" proponed by Mr Tamworth, 12th August 1565.

second, that she should offer no countenance or assistance to her rebels.[1]

In this last stipulation Mary was peremptory; for she had discovered that Randolph, the English ambassador, intrigued with Moray, and she then suspected (what is now established beyond a doubt by the original letters of the actors in these unworthy scenes) that Elizabeth's advice and encouragement were at the bottom of the whole rebellion. Without waiting, therefore, for any further communication from England, she deemed it proper to take a determined step. The English ambassador was informed that he must either promise upon his honour to renounce all intercourse with her rebels, or be put under the charge of those who should take care to detect and restrain his practices. Randolph's reply to the Privy-council was more a defiance than an answer. "I will promise nothing," said he, "either on honour, honesty, word, or writing; and as for guards to attend me, they shall fare full ill, unless stronger and better armed than my own servants." Lethington, the secretary, then proposed that he should retire to Berwick; but this, too, he peremptorily refused. "Wheresoever the queen your mistress keeps her court," was his reply, "there, or not far off, is my place. If I am driven from this, it is easy to see what mind is borne to my sovereign."[2] His insolence encouraged Tamworth to equal arrogance: he refused to give Darnley the royal title, and declined accepting a passport, because it bore his signature as king; but this ill-judged presumption cost him dear. On his way home, a hint having been given to the Borderers, he was waylaid, maltreated, and carried a prisoner to Hume Castle, from which he addressed a letter to Cecil, detailing his sorrowful adventure.[3]

In the meantime Elizabeth amused the insurgent barons by large promises and small pecuniary advances; and, thus encouraged, Moray, the duke, and Glencairn, at the head of a thousand men, advanced to Edinburgh, which they entered on the last day of August.[4] The movement proved to be ill-judged and premature. The citizens received them coldly—not a man joined their ranks; it was in vain they endeavoured to excite an alarm that religion was in danger; in vain they addressed a letter to the queen, in which they threatened that, if she continued to pursue them, their blood should be dearly bought;[5] in vain that they despatched urgent entreaties for assistance to Bedford and Cecil.[6] Before time was given for reply Mary had marched against them; a cannonade was opened from the castle, and they were compelled with precipitation and dismay to abandon the capital and retire to Dumfries.[7] From this place they despatched Robert Melvil, brother to the well-known Sir James Melvil, to the English court. He was instructed to require the immediate assistance of three thousand men, and the presence of some ships of war in the Firth.[8]

With these exorbitant demands Elizabeth could not possibly have complied, unless she had been prepared to rush into open war; she was

[1] MS. State-paper Office, offers made by the Queen of Scots to the Queen's Majesty of England; wholly in Randolph's hand, and endorsed by Cecil, 13th August 1565.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, 20th August 1565. [As these inverted commas may possibly mislead a reader, I beg to say, that where they occur, as they do here in reporting any conversation or dialogue, they do not always indicate that the passages are given strictly word for word. Sometimes, indeed, the very words are given; but sometimes only the sense.]

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Tamworth to Cecil, Hume Castle, 21st August 1565.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, 31st August 1565. Same to the same, 1st September 1565.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, contemporary copy. Letter from the Lords to the Queen, sent from Edinburgh to Glasgow, 1st September 1565.

[6] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Border Correspondence; [henceforth to be marked simply by the letters B.C.] Bedford to Cecil, Berwick, 2d September 1565. State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 2d September 1565, Edinburgh.

[7] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, 4th September 1565.

[8] MS. State-paper Office, Instructions given to Robert Melvil, 10th September 1565.

now convinced that Randolph had misled or deceived her, by overrating the strength of the insurgents. She had believed that the whole country was ready to rise against the government of Mary and Darnley, and a short time before Melvil's arrival had directed Bedford to assist them both with money and soldiers.[1] On discovering, however, the real weakness of Moray's faction, these orders were countermanded, and the insurgents found themselves in the alarming predicament of having risen in rebellion trusting to succours which never arrived.[2]

Nor did Mary give Elizabeth time, even had she so determined, to save her friends. Before a company of horse, pikes, or bowmen could have reached the Borders, the Scottish queen had swept with her forces through Fife; inflicted chastisement on the Laird of Grange and other barons who had joined the rebels; levied a heavy fine on the towns of Dundee and St Andrews; seized castle Campbell, and prepared, at the head of an army which rendered opposition fruitless, to attack the rebel lords at Dumfries. So keen was she in the pursuit that she rode with pistols at her saddle bow, and declared to Randolph that she would rather peril her crown than lose her revenge.[3]

At this crisis the Earl of Bothwell returned from France, profiting by the disgrace of Moray, whose power had expelled him from his country. He was favourably received by the queen, although well known to be a rash, daring, and profligate man; but his extensive Border estates gave him much power, and the circumstances in which Mary was placed made her welcome any baron who could bring a formidable force into the field.[4] In his company came David Chambers, a person of a dark, intriguing spirit, who had long been a retainer of this nobleman's, and although a lord of the session, more likely to outrage than administer the law.

Aware that the arrival of such partisans would be followed by the most determined measures, the rebel lords made a last effort to alarm Elizabeth on the subject of religion. They transmitted to Robert Melvil, their envoy in England, a paper entitled "Informations to be given to the Queen's Majesty, in favour of the Church of Christ, now begun to be persecuted in the chief members of the same."[5] Even the title of this paper contained a misrepresentation of the truth, for at this moment, so far from persecution, there was complete religious toleration in Scotland. Its contents, too, were of questionable accuracy; certainly highly coloured. Melvil was directed to assure the English queen that nothing was meant by Mary, and him who was now joined with her, but the utter subversion of the religion of Jesus Christ within the realm, and the erecting again of all papistry and superstition. "The cause," said they, "why our destruction is sought is, first, the zeal that we bear to the maintenance of the true religion; and, secondly, the care that we have to redress the great enormities lately crept into the public regimen of this miserable commonwealth." The patrimony of the crown was described as so dilapidated that it was impossible the common expenses could be borne; and this, they affirmed, had led to the persecution of honourable men, and the promotion of crafty foreigners, chiefly two Italians, David Riccio and Francisco, who, with other unworthy persons, occupied the place in council belonging to the ancient nobility. As to the Earl of Moray, he was hated, they said, because he would not support Riccio in his abuses; whilst a

[1] The Queen to Bedford, September 12, 1565. Appendix to Robertson's History of Scotland, vol. i. No. xiii.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lords of Scotland to Mr Melvil, Dumfries, 15th September 1565.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, September 9, 1565. Ibid., same to the same, Edinburgh, August 27, 1565. Ibid., same to the same, Edinburgh, September 4, 1565.

[4] MS. State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, September 19 and 20, 1565. The same to the same, Edinburgh, September 1, 1565.

[5] MS. State-paper Office, Informations given to the Queen's Majesty of England, and the Council, in favour of religion in Scotland, September 22, 1565.

stranger, (meaning Darnley,) the subject of another realm, had intruded himself into the state, and claimed the name and authority of a king, without their consent, against all order that ever was used in this realm; and now, because they desired redress of these great enormities, they were persecuted as traitors and enemies to the commonwealth.[1]

Although in some parts exaggerated, these fears and accusations were not without foundation. Mary had undoubtedly negotiated with the Roman see for an advance of money, and the pope had transmitted to her the sum of eight thousand crowns in a vessel, which, being wrecked on the coast of England, fell a prey to the cupidity of the Earl of Northumberland.[2]

She was in correspondence also with Philip II., who had expressed to the Cardinal Pacheco, the papal envoy, his determination to assist her to subdue her rebels, maintain the Catholic faith, and vindicate her right to the English throne. Nor did the Spanish king confine himself to mere promises. He had sent a remittance of twenty thousand crowns to Guzman de Silva, his ambassador at the court of England, with orders to employ it "with the utmost secrecy and address in the support of the Scottish queen and her husband."[3] It was true, also, that Mary had appointed Riccio to the place of French secretary. This foreigner, who was a Milanese, had come to Scotland in the train of Moret, the Savoy ambassador, and his ambition was at first satisfied with the humble office of a singer in the queen's band; but, being well educated, he was occasionally employed in other matters, and on the dismissal of Raulet, her French secretary, Mary rewarded his talent with the vacant office. But when betrayed, as she had repeatedly been by her own nobility, to whom office, but not fidelity, was transmitted by birth, it was not wonderful that the queen employed those whom she could better trust; and, on the whole, the arguments of the insurgents produced little effect upon Elizabeth. She was convinced of the power and popularity of the Scottish queen; the feebleness of Moray and his associates, whom she had bribed into rebellion, was proved beyond a doubt; and the moment this was discovered they were abandoned to their fate, without pity or remorse. True to her wonted dissimulation in all state policy, she assured them that she still favoured their enterprise, and was moved by their distress; but no remonstrances of Moray, who loudly declared that desertion was ruin, could extort from her either money or troops.[4] At this moment, Monsieur de Mauvissiere, better known as the Sieur de Castelnau, was in England, whither he had been sent by his master the French king, to accomplish, if possible, a reconciliation between Mary and Elizabeth. By the advice of Cecil, Mauvissiere and Cockburn, the last a creature of this minister, and known to Mary as an archer in the Scottish Guard, repaired to Scotland, and made an attempt to procure a pardon for Moray and his associates. To both the queen readily gave audience, and the picture given by them of the miserable and distracted state of her kingdom was so sad and true as to draw many tears from her eyes;[5] but when the terms upon which they proposed to mediate were stated, her spirit rose against the imperious dictation of Elizabeth, she dismissed the envoys, and proceeded instantly against her rebels, who still lay, with a few horse, at Dumfries. On advancing at the head of her army, Lord Maxwell, the most powerful baron in these quarters, hastened to make his submission; and Moray, with the chiefs

[1] Id., ut supra.
[2] Keith, p. 316.
[3] Gonzalez Apuntamientos para la Historia del Rey Felipe II., p. 312, published in vol. vii. of the Memoirs of the Historical Society of Madrid. The work was pointed out to me by a kind and respected friend, to whom I am indebted for some valuable papers and references—Mr Howard of Corby Castle.

[4] MS. State-paper Office, an answer for Robert Melvil, October 1st, 1565. Entirely in Cecil's hand.
[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Edinburgh, October 2, 1565, Captain Cockburn to Cecil. "She wept wondrous sore."

of his faction, fled in terror to Carlisle.[1]

From this city the Scottish earl addressed a letter of remonstrance to Cecil, imploring his mistress to save them from the wreck of "honour, conscience, and estate." On the other hand, Mary, a few days before, had written in spirited terms to Elizabeth. It had been reported, she said, much to her astonishment, that her sister of England intended to protect her rebellious subjects who had fled to the Borders. She declared her unwillingness to give credit to such tales; but, should they prove true, should she make common cause with such traitors, she avowed her resolution to denounce such wrongful dealings to all the foreign princes who were her allies. The English queen was alarmed. The French and Spanish ambassadors took Mary's part, and accused Elizabeth, in no measured terms, of fomenting civil commotions in other realms that she might avert danger from her own. It was her favourite policy, they affirmed: Scotland proved it; and at this instant the rebels there acted by her encouragement, and in their distress looked to her as their last resource.

Moray, by this time, was travelling to the English court, and Elizabeth found herself in an awkward predicament; but it was necessary to take immediate measures, and those which she adopted strongly marked her character. An envoy was hurried off to command the Scottish earl and his friends, on pain of her displeasure, to remain at a distance. This was the public message intended to vindicate her fair dealing to the world. The messenger encountered and stopped Moray at Ware. Here the earl remained, and here he soon received a secret message, permitting him to come forward.[2] He obeyed, and was admitted into the presence of the English queen; but it was to be made an actor in a scene which overwhelmed him with confusion. She had summoned the French and Spanish ambassadors to be present. Moray and the Abbot of Kilwinning entered the apartment, fell upon their knees, and implored her intercession with the queen their mistress. "I am astonished," said Elizabeth, "that you have dared, without warning, to come before me; are you not branded as rebels to your sovereign? have you not spurned her summons, and taken arms against her authority? I command you, on the faith of a gentleman, to declare the truth." Moray repelled the charge of treason, lamented that he was encompassed with enemies, who made it dangerous for him to come to court, and declared that the accusation that he had plotted to seize the person of his sovereign, and had been encouraged in his rebellion by the Queen of England, was utterly false and ridiculous. The whole pageant had evidently been arranged beforehand,[3] and Elizabeth's answer was in perfect keeping. Turning in proud triumph to the foreign ambassadors, she bade them mark his words, and then, with an expression of anger and contempt, she addressed Moray and the Abbot of Kilwinning, still on their knees before her. "It is well," said she, "that you have told the truth: for neither did I, nor any one else in my name, ever encourage you in your unnatural rebellion against your sovereign; nor, to be mistress of a world, could I maintain any subject in disobedience to his prince: it might move God to punish me by a similar trouble in my own realm. But as for you two, ye are unworthy traitors, and I command you instantly to leave my presence."[4]

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Bedford to Cecil, Carlisle, October 14, 1565.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Moray to the Privy-council, Ware, October 21, 1565. MS. State-paper Office, Copy of the speech to the Earl of Moray, October 23, corrected throughout and partly written in Cecil's hand.

[3] MS. State-paper Office, Copy of the Queen's speech to the Earl of Moray, before the French ambassador, the Sieur de Mauvissiere, and the Queen's council, October 23. Also Melvil's Memoirs, p. 57.

[4] MS. State-paper Office, Copy of the Queen's speech to the Earl of Moray, before the French ambassador, the Sieur de Mauvissiere, and the Queen's council, October 23.

The earl and his friend were then ignominiously driven from court, and care was taken to render as public as possible the severe treatment they had received, so that the news soon reached the court in Scotland, and occasioned great triumph to the party of Mary and the king. "All the contrary faction," said Randolph, in a letter from Edinburgh to Cecil, "are discouraged, and think themselves utterly undone."[1] Nor did they want good reason to think so, for the Scottish queen summoned a parliament to meet in February, and it was publicly declared that the forfeiture of Moray and his adherents was the principal business to be brought before it.[2]

It is scarcely necessary here to repeat, what has been apparent from innumerable examples in the course of this history, that feudal forfeiture was in these days equivalent to absolute ruin; that it stripped the most potent baron at once of his whole estates and authority, throwing him either as an outcast upon the charity of some foreign country, or exposing him to be hunted down by those vassals whose allegiance followed the land, and not the lord.

To avert this dreadful calamity Moray exerted himself to the utmost. He interceded with Leicester, he wrote to Cecil, imploring him to save him from being "wrecked for ever."[3] He addressed a letter to Elizabeth, and he even condescended to court Riccio.

The influence of this Milanese adventurer had been gradually increasing. At this moment Maitland of Lethington, the secretary of state, was suspected of having been nearly connected with the rebellion of Moray;[4] and, as a trustworthy servant was a prize rarely to be found, the queen began to consult her French secretary in affairs of secrecy and moment. The step was an imprudent one, and soon was attended with the worst effects. It roused the jealousy of the king, a weak and suspicious youth, who deemed it an affront that a stranger of low origin should presume to interfere in state affairs; and it turned Riccio's head, who began to assume, in his dress, equipage, and establishment, a foolish state, totally unsuited to his rank.[5] In the meantime, his influence was great, and Moray bespoke his good offices by the present of a rich diamond, with a letter soliciting his assistance.[6]

Had Mary been left to herself, there is little doubt that her rebels would have been pardoned. Her natural generosity, and the intercession of some powerful friends, strongly impelled her to the side of mercy;[7] and she had already consented to delay the parliament, and to entertain proposals for the restoration of the banished lords, when an unforeseen circumstance occurred, which led to unfortunate results. This was the arrival of two gentlemen, De Rambouillet and Clernau, on a mission from the French court. Their message was outwardly one of mere ceremony, to invest the young king with the order of St Michael; but, amid the festivities attendant on the installation, a more important and secret communication took place. Clernau, the special envoy of the Cardinal Lorraine, and Thornton, a messenger from Beaton, the Scottish ambassador in France, who had come to court about the same time, informed Mary of the coalition which had been concluded between France, Spain, and the emperor, for the destruction of the Protestant cause in Europe. It was a design worthy of the dark and unscrupulous politicians by whom it had been planned—Catherine of Medicis, and the Duke of Alva. In the summer of the preceding year, the Queen-dowager of France and Alva had met at Bayonne, during a progress, in which she con-

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, November 8, 1565.
[2] Ibid., Edinburgh, December 23, 1565.
[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Moray to Cecil, Newcastle, January 9, 1565-6. Also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Moray to Leicester, Newcastle, December 25, 1565.
[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, December 1, 1565.
[5] Spottiswood, p. 193.
[6] Sir James Melvil's Memoirs, p. 157. Bannatyne Club edition.
[7] Sir J. Melvil, p. 146.

ducted her youthful son and sovereign, Charles IX., through the southern provinces of his kingdom; and there, whilst the court was dissolved in pleasure, those secret conferences were held which issued in the resolution that toleration must be at an end, and that the only safety for the Roman Catholic faith was the extermination of its enemies.[1]

Thornton accordingly brought from the Cardinal Lorraine the "*band*" or league which had been drawn up on this occasion; it was whispered that some of her friends in England were parties to it, and Mary was strongly urged to become a member of the coalition. Her intention of pardoning Moray and her other rebels was at the same time opposed by these foreign envoys, with the utmost earnestness. It was represented as her only safe policy to crush, while she had it in her power, that busy Protestant faction, which had been so long encouraged, and was even at this moment secretly supported by Elizabeth, and to join that sacred league to which she was united, as well by the bonds of a mutual faith as by those of blood and affection. If she adopted this method, it was argued, her authority within her realm would be placed upon a secure foundation; if she neglected it, her misfortunes, however complicated they had already been, were only in their commencement.

Riccio, who at this moment possessed much influence, and was, on good grounds, suspected to be a pensioner of Rome, seconded these views with all his power. On the other hand, she did not want advisers on the side of wisdom and mercy. Sir James Melvil in Scotland, and Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, one of her most powerful friends in England, earnestly implored her to pardon Moray, and adopt a conciliatory course.[2] Mary was not naturally inclined to harsh or cruel measures, and for some time she vacillated between the adoption of temperate and violent counsels. But now the entreaties of her uncle the cardinal, the advice of her ambassador, the prejudices of her education, and the intolerance of the Protestants, and of Elizabeth, by whom she had been so often deceived, all united to influence her decision, and overmaster her better judgment. In an evil hour she signed the league, and determined to hurry on the parliament for the forfeiture of the rebels. This may, I think, be regarded as one of the most fatal errors of her life; and it proved the source of all her future misfortunes. She united herself to a bigoted and unprincipled association, which, under the mask of defending the truth, offered an outrage to the plainest precepts of the gospel. She imagined herself a supporter of the Catholic Church when she was giving her sanction to one of the worst corruptions of Romanism; and she was destined to reap the consequences of such a step in all their protracted bitterness.

The moment the queen's resolution was known, it blasted the hopes of Moray, and threw him and all Mary's enemies upon desperate courses. If the estates were allowed to meet, the consequence to them was ruin; if the councillors continued unchanged, and Riccio's advice was followed, it was certain the estates would meet: what, then, was to be done? The time was fast running on, and the remedy, if there was to be any, must be sudden. Such being the crisis, it was at once determined that the meeting of parliament should be arrested, the government of the queen and her ministers overturned; and that, to effect this, Riccio must be murdered. This last atrocious expedient was no new idea, for the seeds of an unformed conspiracy against the foreign favourite had been sown some time before; and of this Moray's friends now availed themselves, artfully uniting the two plots into one, the object of which was, the return of Moray, the dethronement of the queen, and the

[1] Keith, p. 325. Mezerai Abrégé Chronologique de l'Histoire de France, vol. v. pp. 87-8. Randolph to Cecil, February 7, 1565-6. Robertson's Appendix, No. xiv. Also, Bedford to Cecil, 14th February 1565-6, British Museum, Caligula, book x. fol. 391.

[2] Sir J. Melvil's Memoirs, pp. 141, 144.

re-establishment of the Protestant leaders in the power which they had lost.

The origin, growth, and subsequent combination of these two conspiracies have never yet been understood, although they can be distinctly traced. The first plot for the death of Riccio was, strange to say, formed by no less personages than the young king and his father the Earl of Lennox. It had its rise in the jealousy and ambition of these unprincipled men, and the imprudent conduct of Mary. In the early ardour of her affection, the queen had promised Darnley the *crown matrimonial*, by which was meant an equal share with herself in the government; but after a few months she had the misery to discover that her love had been thrown away upon a husband whom it was impossible for her to treat with confidence or respect. He was fickle, proud, and suspicious; ambitious of power, yet incapable of business, and the easy dupe of every crafty or interested companion whom he met. It became necessary for Mary to draw back from her first promise. This led to coldness, to reproaches, soon to an absolute estrangement; even in public he treated her with harshness; he became addicted to low dissipation,[1] forsook her company, and threw himself into the hands of her enemies. They persuaded him that Riccio was the sole author of those measures which had deprived him of his due share in the government. But this was not all: Darnley had the folly to become the dupe of a more absurd delusion. He became jealous of the Italian secretary: he believed that he had supplanted him in the affections of the queen; he went so far as to assert that he had dishonoured his bed; and, in a furious state of mind, sent his cousin George Douglas to implore Lord Ruthven, in whom he had great confidence, to assist him against "the villain David."[2] Ruthven was at this moment confined to bed by a dangerous sickness, which might have been supposed to unfit him for such desperate projects. He was, as he himself informs us, "scarcely able to walk twice the length of his chamber;" yet he consented to engage in the murder, and Darnley was sworn to keep all secret. But Randolph, the English minister, having become acquainted with the plot, revealed it to Leicester in a remarkable letter, which yet remains. He informed him that the king and his father, Lennox, were determined to murder Riccio; that within ten days the deed would be done; that, as to the queen, the crown would be torn from her whose dishonour was discovered; and that still darker designs were meditated against her person, which he did not dare to commit to writing. From his letter, which is very long, I must give this important passage. "I know now for certain," said he, "that this queen repenteth her marriage; that she hateth him [Darnley] and all his kin. I know that he knoweth himself that he hath a partaker in play and game with him; I know that there are practices in hand, contrived between the father and son, to come by the crown against her will. I know that if that take effect which is intended, David, with the consent of the king, shall have his throat cut within these ten days. Many things grievouser and worse than these are brought to my ears; yea, of things intended against her own person, which, because I think better to keep secret than write to Mr Secretary, I speak not of them but now to your lordship."[3]

At this time Randolph, who, from

[1] Drury to Cecil, 16th February 1565-6. Keith, 329.

[2] This was about the 10th February. Ruthven's Narrative in Keith, Appendix, p. 119; and Caligula, book ix. fol. 219. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Ruthven and Morton to Cecil, 27th March 1566.

[3] Randolph to the Earl of Leicester, Edinburgh, 13th February 1565-6. This remarkable letter, which has never been published, is to be found in the Appendix to a privately printed and anonymous work, entitled "Maitland's Narrative," of which only twenty copies were printed. The book was politely presented to me by Mr Dawson Turner, in whose valuable collection of MSS. the original letter is preserved. See Proofs and Illustrations, No. XV.

the terms in which he described it, appears to have had no objection to the plot, was banished by Mary to Berwick, the queen having now discovered certain proof of his having encouraged and assisted Moray in his rebellion.[1] To supply his place, Ruthven, who perceived that the king's intent to murder the Italian gave him a good opportunity to labour for the return of his banished friends, called in the Earl of Morton, then chancellor of the kingdom.[2] This powerful and unscrupulous man proved an able assistant. Under his father, the noted George Douglas, he had been early familiarised with intrigue: he hated Riccio, and dreaded the assembling of parliament almost as much as Moray, from a report that he was to be deprived of certain crown lands, which had been improperly obtained, and to lose the seals as chancellor.[3] Morton, too, was the personal friend of Moray; like him, he belonged to the party of the reformed Church; and when Ruthven and Darnley solicited his aid, he at once embraced the proposal for the murder of the secretary, and proceeded to complete the machinery of the conspiracy, with greater skill than his fierce but less artful associates.

His first endeavour was to strengthen their hands by procuring the cooperation of the party of the reformed Church; his next, to follow out Ruthven's idea, by drawing in Moray, and making the plot the means of his return to power; his last to secure the countenance and support of Elizabeth and her chief ministers, Cecil and Leicester.

In all this he succeeded. The consent and assistance of the leading Protestant barons was soon gained, and to neutralise any opposition on the part of their chief ministers was not found a difficult matter.[4] They were in the deepest alarm at this moment. It was known that Mary had signed the Popish league; it was believed that Riccio corresponded with Rome; and there was no doubt that some measures for the restoration of the Roman Catholic religion were in preparation, and only waited for the parliament to be carried into execution.[5] Having these gloomy prospects before their eyes, Knox and Craig, the ministers of Edinburgh, were made acquainted with the conspiracy;[6] Bellenden, the justice-clerk, Makgill, the clerk register, the Lairds of Brunston, Calder, and Ormiston, and other leading men of that party, were, at the same time, admitted into the secret. It was contended by Morton, that only one way remained to extirpate the Romish faith, and replace religion upon a secure basis: this was to break off the parliament by the murder of Riccio, to imprison the queen, intrust Darnley with the nominal sovereignty, and restore the Earl of Moray to be the head of the government. Desperate as were these designs, the reformed party in Scotland did not hesitate to adopt them. Their horror of idolatry, the name they bestowed on the Roman Catholic religion, misled their judgment and hardened their feelings; and they regarded the plot as the act of men raised up by God for the destruction of an accursed superstition. The General Fast, which always secured the presence of a formidable and numerous band of partisans, was near approaching; and as the murder had

[1] MS. Letter communicated to me by the Hon. William Leslie Melvil; Mary to Melvil, 17th February 1565-6, a copy. Mary confronted Randolph before the privy-council, with Johnston, the person to whom he had delivered the money to be conveyed to Moray; and the evidence being considered conclusive, he received orders to quit the court, and retired to Berwick.

[2] Narrative, ut supra. Keith, p. 120, Appendix. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Morton and Ruthven to Cecil, Berwick, 27th March 1566.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, Berwick, 6th March 1565.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Morton and Ruthven to Cecil, 27th March 1566.

[5] Mary's own words in her letter describing the murder of Riccio, addressed to Beaton, her ambassador at the French court, are quite explicit upon this point. "The spiritual estate," says she, "being placed therein in the ancient manner, tending to have done some good anent restoring *the auld religion*." Keith, p. 331.

[6] See the evidence on which this fact is now stated for the first time in Proofs and Illustrations, No. XVI.

been fixed for the week in March in which the parliament had been summoned, it was contrived that this religious solemnity should be held in the capital at the same time: this secured Morton, and enabled him to work with greater boldness.[1]

Having so far organised the conspiracy, it remained to communicate it to Moray; and for this purpose the king's father, the Earl of Lennox, repaired to England.[2] It required no great persuasion to induce Moray, now in banishment, and over whose head forfeiture and ruin were impending, to embrace a plot which promised to avert all danger, and restore him to the station he had lost. It was accordingly arranged by him, with Grange, Ochiltree the father-in-law of Knox, and the other banished lords, that as soon as the day for the murder was fixed, they should be informed of it, and then order matters so that their return to Edinburgh should take place instantly after it was committed.[3] But this was not all. According to a common but revolting practice of this age, which combined the utmost feudal ferocity with a singular love of legal formalities, it was resolved that "covenants" or contracts for the commission of the murder, and the benefits to be derived from it, should be entered into, and signed by the young king himself and the rest of the conspirators. Two "bands," or "covenants," were accordingly drawn up: the first ran in the king's name alone, although many were parties to it. It stated that the queen's "gentle and good nature" was abused by some wicked and ungodly persons, specially an Italian stranger called David; it declared his resolution, with the assistance of certain of his nobility and others, to seize these enemies; and if any difficulty or resistance occurred, "to cut them off immediately, and slay them wherever it happened;" and solemnly promised, on the word of a prince, to maintain and defend his assistants and associates in the enterprise, though carried into execution in presence of the queen's majesty, and within the precincts of the palace.[4] By whom this agreement was signed, besides the king, Morton, and Ruthven, does not appear; but it is certain that its contents were communicated, amongst others, to Moray, Argyle, Rothes, Maitland, Grange, and the Lords Boyd and Lindsay. Of these persons, some were in England, and could not personally assist in the assassination; and to them, among others, Morton and Ruthven no doubt alluded, when they afterwards declared that the most honest and the most worthy were easily induced to approve of the intended murder, and to support their prince in its execution.[5] The second "covenant" has been also preserved. It was supplementary to the first, its purpose being to bind the king on the one hand, and the conspirators on the other, to the performance of those conditions which were considered for their mutual advantage. The parties to it were the king, the Earls of Moray, Argyle, Glencairn, and Rothes, the Lords Boyd and Ochiltree, and their "complices." They promised to support Darnley in all his just quarrels, to be friends to his friends, and enemies to his enemies; to give him the crown matrimonial, to maintain the Protestant religion, to put down its enemies, and uphold every reform founded on the Word of God. For his part, the king engaged to pardon Moray and the banished lords, to stay all proceedings for their forfeiture, and to restore them to their lands and dignities.[6]

Such was now the forward state of

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Morton and Ruthven to Cecil, 27th March 1566. Knox, History, pp. 429-431.

[2] Calderwood, MS., British Museum, Ayscough, 4735, fol. 642.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Edinburgh, 25th February 1565, *i.e.*, 1565-6, Randolph to Cecil; also, Ibid., March 8, 1565-6, Berwick. Bedford and Randolph to Leicester and Cecil. Ibid., MS. Letter, Moray to Cecil, Newcastle, March 8, 1565-6.

[4] British Museum, Caligula, book ix. fol. 212, copy of the time. Endorsed by Randolph.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Morton and Ruthven to Cecil, Berwick, March 27, 1566. Also, Keith, p. 120.

[6] State-paper Office, copy by Randolph from the original: "Conditions for the earls to perform to their king," and "Conditions to

the conspiracy for the murder of Riccio, the restoration of Moray, and the revolution in the government; and it appears to have assumed this form only a few days previous to Randolph's dismissal from the Scottish court. One only step remained: to communicate the plot to the Queen of England and her ministers, and to obtain their appr oval and support. Randolph was now at Berwick with the Earl of Bedford, the lieutenant of the north; and from this place these persons wrote on the 6th of March to Elizabeth, informing her of "a matter of no small consequence being intended in Scotland," referring to a more particular statement which they had transmitted to Cecil, adding that Moray would thus be brought home; that Tuesday was the last day, and that they looked daily to hear of its execution.[1]

The other letter from Bedford and Randolph to Cecil, written on the same day, was far more explicit. It enjoined the strictest secrecy: they had promised, they said, upon their honour, that none except the queen, Leicester, and Cecil himself, should be informed of "the great attempt," now on the eve of being put in execution; and they went on thus to describe it:—

"The matter is this: Somewhat we are sure you have heard of divers discords and jarrers[2] between this queen and her husband, partly for that she hath refused him the crown matrimonial, partly for that he hath assured knowledge of such usage of herself, as altogether is intolerable to be borne, which, if it were not overwell known, we would both be very loath to think that it could be true. To take away this occasion of slander, he is himself determined to be at the apprehension and execution of him whom he is able manifestly to charge with the crime, and to have done him the most dishonour that can be to any man, much more being as he is. We need not more plainly to describe the person: you have heard of the man whom we mean of.

"To come by the other thing which he desireth, which is the crown matrimonial, what is devised and concluded upon by him and the noblemen, you shall see by the copies of the conditions between them and him, of which Mr Randolph assureth me to have seen the principals, and taken the copies written with his own hand.

"The time of execution and performance of these matters is before the parliament, as near as it is. To this determination of theirs, there are privy in Scotland these: Argyle, Morton, Boyd, Ruthven, and Lethington. In England these: Moray, Rothes, Grange, myself, and the writer hereof. If persuasions to cause the queen to yield to these matters do no good, they purpose to proceed we know not in what sort. If she be able to make any power at home, she shall be withstood, and herself kept from all other counsel than her own nobility. If she seek any foreign support, the queen's majesty our sovereign shall be sought, and sued unto to accept his and their defence, with offers reasonable to her majesty's contentment. These are the things which we thought and think to be of no small importance; and knowing them certainly intended, and concluded upon, thought it our duties to utter the same to you Mr Secretary, to make declaration thereof as shall seem best to your wisdom. And of this matter thought to write conjunctly, though we came severally by knowledge, agreeing both in one in the substance of that which is determined. At Berwick, 6th March 1565.[3]

"F. BEDFORD.

"TH. RANDOLPHE."

I have given this long extract as the letter is of much importance, and has never before been known. It proves that Elizabeth received the

be performed by the King of Scots to the earls." Endorsed in Cecil's hand, Primo Martii, 1565-6.

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Bedford and Randolph to the Queen, Berwick, March 1, 1565-6.

[2] Jars.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, March 6, 1565, Berwick. Earl of Bedford and Thomas Randolph to Secretary Cecil, endorsed by Cecil's clerk, *Earl of Bedford and Mr Randolph to my Mr.*

most precise intimation of the intended murder of Riccio; that she was made fully acquainted with the determination to secure the person of the Scottish queen, and create a revolution in the government. Moray's share in the conspiracy, and his consent to the assassination of the foreign secretary, are established by the same letter beyond a doubt; and we see the declared object of the plot was to put an end to his banishment, to replace him in the power which he had lost, and, by one decided and triumphant blow, to destroy the schemes which were in agitation for the re-establishment of the Roman Catholic religion in Scotland. It is of great moment to attend to the conduct of Elizabeth at this crisis. She knew all that was about to occur: the life of Riccio, the liberty—perhaps, too, the life—of Mary was in her hands; Moray was at her court; the conspirators were at her devotion; they had given the fullest information to Randolph, that he might consult the queen: she might have imprisoned Moray, discomfited the plans of the conspirators, saved the life of the miserable victim who was marked for slaughter, and preserved Mary, to whom she professed a warm attachment, from captivity. All this might have been done, perhaps it is not too much to say, that even in these dark times it would have been done, by a monarch acutely alive to the common feelings of humanity. But Elizabeth adopted a very different course: she not only allowed Moray to leave her realm, she dismissed him with marks of the highest confidence and distinction; and this baron, when ready to set out for Scotland, to take his part in those dark transactions which soon after followed, sent his secretary Wood, to acquaint Cecil with the most secret intentions of the conspirators.[1]

Whilst these terrible designs were in preparation against her, some hints of approaching danger were conveyed to the Scottish queen; but she imprudently disregarded them. Riccio, too, received a mysterious caution from Damiot an astrologer, whom he used to consult, and who bade him beware of the bastard, evidently alluding to George Douglas, the natural son of the Earl of Angus, and one of the chief conspirators; but he imagined that he pointed to Moray, then in banishment, and derided his apprehensions.[2] Meantime everything was in readiness; a large concourse of the friends of the Reformed Church assembled at Edinburgh for the week of fasting and humiliation: directions for prayer and sermons had been previously drawn up by Knox and the ministers, and the subjects chosen were such as seemed calculated to prepare the public mind for resistance, violence, and bloodshed. They were selected from the Old Testament alone, and included, amongst other examples, the slaying of Oreb and Zeeb, the cutting off of the Benjamites, the fasting of Esther, the hanging of Haman, inculcating the duty of inflicting swift and summary vengeance on all who persecuted the people of God.[3]

On the 3d of March the fast commenced in the capital, and on the 4th parliament assembled. It was opened by the queen in person, and the Lords of the Articles having been chosen, the statute of treason and forfeiture against Moray and the banished lords was prepared. This was on a Thursday; and on Tuesday, in the following week, the act was to be passed; but it was fearfully arrested in its progress.[4]

On Saturday evening, about seven o'clock, when it was dark, the Earls of Morton and Lindsay, with a hundred

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, March 8, 1565-6, Newcastle, Moray to Cecil. See also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B. C., Bedford to Cecil, Berwick, March 8, 1565-6. Also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Bedford and Randolph to Leicester and Cecil, Berwick, March 8, 1565-6.

[2] Spottiswood, p. 194.

[3] Knox, pp. 340, 341, Treatise on Fasting, &c., a rare Tract. Edinburgh, 1565, Lekprevik. Kindly communicated to me by my friend, Mr James Chalmers; and Goodall, vol. i. pp. 248, 249.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Bedford and Randolph to Leicester and Cecil, Berwick, 8th March 1565–6. Ibid., Same to the queen, 6th March 1565–6.

and fifty men bearing torches and weapons, occupied the court of the palace of Holyrood, seized the gates without resistance, and closed them against all but their own friends. At this moment Mary was at supper in a small closet or cabinet, which entered from her bed-chamber. She was attended by the Countess of Argyle, the Commendator of Holyrood, Beaton, master of the household, Arthur Erskine, captain of the guard, and her secretary Riccio. The bed-chamber communicated by a secret turnpike-stair with the king's apartment below, to which the conspirators had been admitted; and Darnley, ascending this stair, threw up the arras which concealed its opening in the wall, entered the little apartment where Mary sat, and, casting his arm fondly round her waist, seated himself beside her at table. A minute had scarcely passed when Ruthven, clad in complete armour, abruptly broke in. This man had just risen from a sick-bed, his features were sunk and pale from disease, his voice hollow, and his whole appearance haggard and terrible. Mary, who was now seven months gone with child, started up in terror, commanding him to be gone; but ere the words were uttered, torches gleamed in the outer room, a confused noise of voices and weapons was heard, and the next moment George Douglas, Car of Faudonside, and other conspirators, rushed into the closet.[1] Ruthven now drew his dagger, and calling out that their business was with Riccio, made an effort to seize him; whilst this miserable victim springing behind the queen, clung by her gown, and in his broken language called out, "Giustizia, Giustizia! sauve ma vie, Madame, sauve ma vie!"[2] All was now uproar and confusion; and though Mary earnestly implored them to have mercy, they were deaf to her entreaties: the table and lights were thrown down, Riccio was stabbed by Douglas over the queen's shoulder; Car of Faudonside, one of the most ferocious of the conspirators, held a pistol to her breast, and whilst she shrieked with terror, their bleeding victim was torn from her knees, and dragged amidst shouts and execrations through the queen's bed-room, to the entrance of the presence chamber. Here Morton and his men rushed upon him, and buried their daggers in his body. So eager and reckless were they in their ferocity, that in the struggle to get at him, they wounded one another; nor did they think the work complete till the body was mangled by fifty-six wounds, and left in a pool of blood, with the king's dagger sticking in it, to shew, as was afterwards alleged, that he had sanctioned the murder.[3]

Nothing can more strongly shew the ferocious manners of the times than an incident which now occurred. Ruthven, faint from sickness, and reeking from the scene of blood, staggered into the queen's cabinet, where Mary still stood distracted and in terror of her life. Here he threw himself upon a seat, called for a cup of wine, and being reproached for the cruelty of his conduct, not only vindicated himself and his associates, but plunged a new dagger into the heart of the unhappy queen, by declaring that her husband had advised the whole. She was then ignorant of the completion of the murder, but suddenly one of her ladies rushed into the room and cried out that their victim was slain. "And is it so?" said Mary; "then farewell tears, we must now think of revenge."[4]

[1] Mary to the Bishop of Glasgow, 2d April, 1566. Keith, p. 330. Also, Bedford and Randolph to the Council, 27th March 1566. Ellis, vol. ii., first series, p. 207. Morton and Ruthven's Narrative. Caligula, book ix. fol. 219, more full than that in Keith, App. 120, which is a Copy.

[2] Birrel's Diary, p. 5.

[3] Drury to Cecil, B.C., Berwick, 27th March 1566, "David had fifty-six wounds, whereof thirty-four were in his back." "Such desire," says Drury, "was to have him surely and speedily slain, that in jabbing at him so many at once, as some bestowed their daggers where neither they meant it not, nor the receivers willing to have it; as one can, for his own good, now in this town, (a follower to my Lord Ruthven,) be too true a testimony, who carries the bag in [on] his hand."

[4] Morton and Ruthven's Narrative, ut supra. Spottiswood, p. 195.

Having finished the first act of this tragedy, the conspirators proceeded to follow out their preconcerted measures. The queen was kept a prisoner in her apartment, and strictly guarded. The king, assuming the sole power, addressed his royal letters dissolving the parliament, and commanding the estates to leave the capital within three hours, on pain of treason; orders were despatched to the magistrates enjoining them with their city force to keep a vigilant watch, and suffer none but Protestants to leave their houses; and to Morton, the chancellor, with his armed retainers, was intrusted the guarding the gates of the palace, with strict injunction that none should escape from it.[1]

This, however, amid the tumult of a midnight murder, was not so easy a task. Huntly and Bothwell contrived to elude the guards. Sir James Balfour and James Melvil were equally fortunate; and as this last gentleman passed beneath the queen's window, she threw up the sash and implored him to warn the citizens to save her from the traitors who had her in their power. Soon after the common bell was heard ringing, so speedily had the message been carried; and the chief magistrate, with a body of armed townsmen, rushed confusedly into the palace court, demanding the instant deliverance of their sovereign. But Mary in vain implored to speak with them; she was dragged back from the window by the ruffians, who threatened to cut her in pieces if she attempted to shew herself; and in her stead the pusillanimous Darnley was thrust forward. He addressed the citizens, assured them that both he and the queen were in safety, and, commanding them on their allegiance to go home, was instantly obeyed.[2]

Thus ended all hope of rescue; but although baffled in this attempt, secluded even from her women, trembling and justly fearing for her life, the queen's courage and presence of mind did not forsake her. She remonstrated with her husband; she even condescended to reason with Ruthven, who replied in rude and upbraiding terms; and at last, exhausted with this effort, she would have sunk down, had they not called for her ladies and left her to repose. Next morning all the horrors of her condition broke fully upon her: she was a prisoner, in the hands of a band of assassins; they were led by her husband, who watched all her motions; he had already assumed the royal power, she was virtually dethroned; who could tell what dark purposes might not be meditated against her person. These thoughts agitated her to excess, and threw her into a fever, in which she imagined the ferocious Ruthven was coming to murder her, and shrieking out that she was abandoned by all, was threatened with miscarriage. The piteous sight revived Darnley's affection; her gentlewomen were admitted, and the danger passed away; yet so strong was the suspicion with which she was guarded, that no lady was allowed to pass "muffled" from the queen's chamber.[3]

It was now Sunday night, the murder had been committed late on Saturday evening; and, according to their previous concert, Moray, Rothes, and Ochiltree, with others of the banished lords, arrived in the capital and instantly rode to the palace. They were welcomed by Darnley; and so little did Mary suspect Moray's foreknowledge of the murder that she instantly sent for him, and throwing herself into his arms in an agony of tears, exclaimed, "If my brother had been here he never would have suffered me to have been thus cruelly handled." The sight overcame him, and he is reported to have wept; but, if sincere, his compunction was momentary, for from the queen he repaired to Morton, and in a meeting with the whole conspirators it was resolved to shut up their sovereign in Stirling Castle, to compel her to give the crown and the whole government of the realm to

[1] Morton and Ruthven's Narrative, Keith, Appendix, p. 126.

[2] Mary to Archbishop Beaton, 2d April 1565-6, in Keith, 332. Melvil's Memoirs, p. 150.

[3] Morton and Ruthven's Narrative. Keith, Appendix, pp. 127, 128.

Darnley, and to confirm the Protestant religion, under the penalty of death or perpetual imprisonment.[1]

Meanwhile, Mary's spirit and courage revived. She perceived that her influence over her husband was not at an end, and exerting those powers of fascination and persuasive language which she possessed in so high a degree, she succeeded in alarming his fears, and awakening his love. She represented to him that he was surrendering himself a tool into the hands of her enemies and his own: if they had belied her honour, if they had periled her life, and that of his unborn infant, could he believe that, when he alone stood between them and their ambition, they would hesitate to destroy him. Already he might see they took the power into their own hands, and when he sent his servants to her, refused to admit them; and then the flagrant falsehood of accusing him as a party to so base a murder—a deed which, had he really contemplated, (but this she was assured he never had,) must cover him with infamy in the eyes of the country and of the world. Their only safety lay in escaping together. If, said she, it is your wish, I am ready to forgive even the bloody men whose atrocious act you have just witnessed.—Go and tell them so—but let them treat me as a free queen, let them remove their guards, avoid the palace which they have polluted with blood, and I will sign a written pardon for them on the spot. Darnley was won by her arguments, and becoming terrified for the consequences of the murder, took refuge in falsehood, denied all connexion with the conspiracy, and placed himself in the hands of Mary with the same facility which had lately made him the slave of the conspirators. Ruthven and Morton, however, were not so easily deceived, and insisted that the queen meant only to betray them. The king replied she was a true princess, that he would stake his life for her faith and honour,[2] and led the conspirators to her presence, where she heard their defence, assured them of her readiness to pardon, and sent them away to draw up a writing for their security. They did so, delivered the paper to Darnley, left the palace, removed the guards, and permitted the servants of the household to resume their charge. To lull suspicion, the queen retired to rest, and Ruthven and his associates deeming all safe, betook themselves to the house of Morton, the chancellor, as we have seen, one of the chief actors in the murder; but at midnight Mary rose, threw herself upon a fleet horse, and, accompanied only by the king and Arthur Erskine, fled to Dunbar. The news of her escape flew through the land; her nobles, Huntly, Athole, Bothwell, and multitudes of barons and gentlemen crowded round her; and in the morning Morton, Ruthven, and the rest of the conspirators awoke only to hear that their victim had eluded their grasp, that an army of her subjects had already assembled at Dunbar, and that the penalties of treason were suspended over their heads.

Mary thus escaped; and it is impossible to withhold our admiration of the coolness, judgment, and courage exhibited by a woman under the dreadful circumstances in which she was called upon to exert these qualities. If we blame her duplicity, let it be remembered that her own life, and that of her infant, were in jeopardy; that there was nothing unreasonable in the idea that the ruffians who had torn her secretary from her knees, and murdered him in her chamber, might, before many hours were over, be induced to repeat the deed upon herself. We may gather, indeed, from the dark and indefinite expressions of Randolph in describing the approaching assassination, that their intentions, if she resisted their wishes, vacillated between murder and perpetual captivity.

Once more free, the queen acted with her usual spirit and decision.

[1] Mary to Beaton. Keith, p. 332.

[2] This assertion of Darnley, which gives a direct contradiction to the story of Mary's alleged passion for Riccio, rests on the evidence of Lord Ruthven, who was present.—See his narrative of the murder in Keith, Appendix, p. 128.

Having regained her ascendancy over the king, she obtained from this weak prince a disclosure of the chief persons engaged in the conspiracy. It would appear, however, that Darnley concealed Moray's guilt, and only denounced Morton, Ruthven, and other associates. Against them the queen took instant steps. She summoned her people to attend her in arms, directed a writ of treason to be issued against the chancellor, Lethington, and their accomplices, and advanced at the head of a force of eight thousand men to the capital.[1] Aware of this, the conspirators fled with the utmost precipitation. Morton, Ruthven, Brunston, and Andrew Car took instant refuge in England; others, scattered hither and thither, concealed themselves in their own country. Knox, in great agony of spirit, and groaning over the Church and his flock, buried himself in the friendly recesses of Kyle, and Lethington hastened to gain the mountain fastnesses of Athole. It was remarkable that Craig, the colleague of Knox, did not leave the city.[2]

To the English queen, and her brother the Earl of Moray, Mary had a more difficult part to act, whilst she felt equal embarrassment as to the degree of confidence to be given to the king. We have seen incontrovertible proof that Moray was a party to the murder, though not a perpetrator of it; that Elizabeth was accessory to the conspiracy, and that Darnley and his father Lennox were the original contrivers of the whole. But of all this Mary at this moment was ignorant. Elizabeth, on being informed of the outrage, expressed the deepest sympathy and indignation; Moray affected an equal abhorrence of everything that had occurred. Darnley not only denounced his former friends, but busied himself in bringing them to justice. The queen, therefore, without renouncing her resolution to punish the murder with the utmost rigour, deemed it prudent in the first instance to secure the active assistance of Elizabeth, to strengthen her ties with France, and to promote a reconciliation amongst her nobility, many of whom were at feud with each other. Bothwell, who during the late disturbances had vigorously exerted himself for his sovereign, was the enemy of Moray and Lethington; Athole, with whom Lethington had taken refuge, was at variance with Argyle; and the differences amongst the leading barons, as usual, extended their ramifications through all their retainers and dependants.

It says much for the judgment of the queen that her efforts to compose these fatal differences were successful. Moray and Bothwell were reconciled, Argyle and Athole agreed to suspend their contests, and Mary seemed even disposed to pardon Morton, Lethington, and the principal conspirators, if the extension of mercy could have brought back peace and security to her kingdom.[3] But this intended leniency only brought upon her more sorrow. Her weak and treacherous husband became alarmed, and more loudly denounced his late friends who had murdered Riccio. This conduct enraged them to the utmost, and they retaliated by again accusing him, in more distinct and positive terms than before, of being the sole instigator and contriver of the murder. To prove this, they laid the "bands," or covenants before the queen, and the dreadful truth broke upon her in all its sickening and heart-rending force.[4] She now understood for the first time that the king was the principal conspirator against her, the defamer

[1] Knox, History, p. 437.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, Berwick, 21st March 1565. M'Crie's Life of Knox, p. 254. I quote from the new and excellent edition of this work by Dr Crichton. See also Knox's Prayer, dated 12th March 1565-6, subjoined to his answer to Tyrie.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 2d April 1566; and Ibid., Robert Melvil to Cecil, 3d April 1566, Edinburgh.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, April 4, Randolph to Cecil. "The queen hath now seen all the covenants and bands that passed between the king and the lords. And now findeth that his declaration before her and the council of his innocency of the death of David was false."

of her honour, the plotter against her liberty and her crown, the almost murderer of herself and her unborn child; he was convicted as a traitor and a liar, false to his own honour, false to her, false to his associates in crime. At this moment Mary must have felt that to have leant upon a husband whom she could trust might, amid the terrible plots with which she was surrounded, have been the means of saving herself and her crown; but on Darnley she could never lean again. Can we wonder that her heart was almost broken by the discovery—that, to use the words of Melvil, she should have loudly lamented the king's folly and unthankfulness, that she was compelled to withdraw from him all confidence, and in solitary bitterness to act entirely for herself.

But if such were the queen's feelings towards the young king, those of the conspirators whom he had betrayed were of a sterner kind. Even in those flagitious days there were sanctions the disregard of which covered a man with infamy and contempt, and amongst these one of the most sacred was fidelity to the written "bands" by which the feudal barons were bound to each other. To one of these Darnley, as we have seen, had become a principal: his fellow-conspirators had performed their promise: he had not only broken his and denied all accession to the plot, but had betrayed the principal actors, and meanly purchased his own safety by their destruction. The consequence was the utmost indignation, and a thirst for revenge upon the part of Morton, Moray, Lethington, and their associates, which, there is reason to believe, increased in intensity till it was assuaged only in his death. These feelings of indignation were not confined to the fugitive lords. Mary avoided his company, and forbade her friends to give him any countenance. She promoted Joseph Riccio, David's brother, who had arrived in the suite of Mauvissiere, the French ambassador, to the dangerous vacancy caused by the murder;[1] and at last became so impatient and miserable under the ties by which she was bound to her husband, that she entertained the extraordinary design of retiring to France, and intrusting the government of her kingdom to a regency, composed of five of her principal lords,—Moray, Mar, Huntly, Athole, and Bothwell.[2] Another scheme which at this moment occupied her mind was the possibility of obtaining a divorce, on which errand it was reported she had sent a messenger, named Thornton, to Rome.[3]

Her feelings, however, though keen, were not bitter or lasting. As the period of her confinement drew near, her resentment softened towards the king. At this moment her mind had become haunted with the terror that Morton and his savage associates, whose hands were stained with the blood of Riccio, had determined to break in upon her during her labour: but the assurances of the English queen, who sent her word that she had dismissed him from her dominions, (which was not strictly true,) restored her to composure.[4] Uncertain that she should survive her confinement, she called for her nobility, took measures regarding the government of the kingdom, made her will, became reconciled to the king, and personally arranged everything either for life or death.[5]

On the 19th of June she was delivered of a prince in the castle of Edinburgh, and immediately despatched Sir James Melvil to carry the news to Elizabeth. The English queen received the intelligence with her usual duplicity. From Cecil, who

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Berwick, April 20, 1566, Drury to Cecil. Also same to same, B.C., Berwick, April 26, 1566. See also Sir Th. Hoby to Cecil, French Correspondence, State-paper Office, 29th April 1566.

[2] MS. Letter, copy, Lethington to Randolph, 27th April 1566. Caligula, book ix. fol. 244.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Berwick, April 25, 1566, Randolph to Cecil.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Berwick, June 13, 1566, Randolph to Cecil. Also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Edinburgh, July 4, 1566, Killigrew to Cecil. Also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Killigrew to Cecil, 24th June 1566.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Berwick, Randolph to Cecil, 7th June 1566.

saw her before Melvil was admitted, and whispered the unwelcome news in her ear as she was dancing at Greenwich, after supper, she could not conceal her feelings. All mirth was at an end, she sat down, leant her cheek on her hand, and then burst forth in lamentations to her ladies, that she was a barren stock, whilst the Queen of Scots was the mother of a fair son. When Melvil had audience next morning, everything was serene. His tidings, she said, gave her the utmost joy, and had cured her of a fifteen days' sickness. She promised also, in reply to his urgent request, that there should be a speedy settlement of the question of the succession.[1]

Meanwhile Mary recovered, and assured of the continuance of amicable relations with England, applied herself with her usual energy to heal the dissensions amongst her nobles, to conduct internal tranquillity and to re-establish a firm government. The great difficulty was the conduct to be pursued with Morton and the banished lords; and the queen soon became convinced that she must sacrifice her own feelings and adopt a lenient course, if she wished to recover her power. Amongst her nobility there was no want of talents or energy; the difficulty was to attach them to the crown, to heal their feuds amongst themselves, to prevent their intrigues with England. So long as Lethington was in disgrace, and the murderers of Riccio were banished, these ends could not be gained. The queen, therefore, listened to the intercession of Moray, whom she now treated with great confidence. Lethington was reconciled to Bothwell, and pardoned; the Lairds of Brunston, Ormiston, Hatton, and Calder, the leaders of the Church party, were received into favour; but Knox still continued in his retreat, and there appears to have been some special rigour manifested against him on the part of the queen.[2] Morton, the arch-conspirator, with his assistants, Lindsay and Ruthven, were still proscribed; but Moray, Bothwell, Argyle, Athole, and Lethington, who now acted together, exerted themselves unremittingly to procure their restoration, and the queen, it was evident, began to think of permitting their return.[3]

This intended mercy enagred the young king, and appears to have driven him upon foolish and dangerous courses: as his opponents were mostly Protestants, he began to intrigue with the Romanists, and went so far as to write secretly to the Pope, arraigning the conduct of the queen, in delaying to restore the mass. When his letters were intercepted, and his practices discovered, he complained bitterly of the neglect into which he had fallen, affirmed that he had no share in the government, accused the nobles of a plot against his life, and at last formed the desperate resolution of leaving the kingdom, and remonstrating to foreign powers against the cruelty with which he was treated.[4] This mad project alarmed his father, Lennox, who communicated his fears to the queen, and Mary made an earnest attempt to restore him to his duty. The interview and remonstrances to which this led are of much importance in estimating the dark charges afterwards brought against Mary; and we fortunately know the whole particulars from the Lords of the Council, before whom it took place, and also from the French ambassador, De Croc, who was present. The queen, it appears, had at first affectionately, and in private, implored Darnley to disclose the causes of his grief. "The queen," said the Lords of the Council, addressing the queen-mother,[5] "condescended so far as to go and meet the king without the palace, and so conducted him into her

1 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Killigrew to Cecil, 24th June 1566, Melvil's Memoirs, Bannatyne edit., p. 161.

2 M'Crie's Life of Knox, p. 254.

3 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Forster to Cecil, September 19, 1566.

4 Monsieur de Croc's Letter to Archbishop Beaton, printed by Keith, p. 345, from the original, then in the Scots College, Paris.

5 Lords of the Privy-council to the Queen-mother, October 8, 1566. Keith, p. 347, being a translation from a copy then in the Scots College at Paris.

own apartment, where he remained all night; and then her majesty entered calmly with him upon the subject of his going abroad, that she might understand from himself the occasion of such a resolution. But he would by no means give or acknowledge that he had any occasion offered him of discontent. The Lords of the Council, being acquainted early next morning that the king was just agoing to return to Stirling, they repaired to the queen's apartment, and no other persons being present, except their lordships, and Monsieur de Croc, whom they prayed to assist with them, as being here on the part of your majesty."

The occasion of their meeting together was then, with all humility and reverence due to their majesties, proposed—namely, to understand from the king, whether, according to advice imparted to the queen by the Earl of Lennox, he had formed a resolution to depart by sea out of the realm, and on what ground, and for what end? That if his resolution proceeded from some discontent, they were earnest to know what persons had afforded an occasion for the same? That if he could complain of any of the subjects of the realm, be they of what quality whatsoever, the fault should be immediately repaired to his satisfaction. "And here," they continued, "we did remonstrate to him, that his own honour, the queen's honour, the honour of us all, were concerned; for if, without just occasion ministered, he would retire from the place where he had received so much honour, and abandon the society of her to whom he is so far obliged, that in order to advance him she has humbled herself, and from being his sovereign had surrendered herself to be his wife; if he should act in this sort, the whole world would blame him as ingrate, regardless of the friendship the queen bare him, and utterly unworthy to possess the place to which she had exalted him. On the other hand, that if any just occasion had been given him, it behoved the same to be very important, since it inclined him to relinquish so beautiful a queen, and noble realm; and the same must have been afforded him either by the queen herself, or by us her ministers. As for us, we professed ourselves ready to do him all the justice he could demand. And for her majesty, so far was she from ministering to him occasion of discontent, that on the contrary, he had all the reason in the world to thank God for giving him so wise and virtuous a person, as she had shewed herself in all her actions."

"Then her majesty," so the letter goes, "was pleased to enter into the discourse, and spoke affectionately to him, beseeching him, that seeing he would not open his mind in private to her the last night, according to her most earnest request, he would, at least, be pleased to declare, before these lords, where she had offended him anything. She likewise said, that she had a clear conscience, that in all her life she had done no action which could any way prejudge either his or her own honour; but nevertheless, that as she might perhaps have given him offence without design, she was willing to make amends as far as he should require, and therefore prayed him not to dissemble the occasion of his displeasure, if any he had, nor to spare her in the least matter. But though the queen and all others that were present, together with Monsieur de Croc, used all the interest they were able, to persuade him to open his mind, yet he would not at all own that he intended any voyage, or had any discontent, and declared freely that the queen had given him no occasion for any."[1] Such is the account given of this important interview by the Lords of the Council; and Monsieur de Croc, in writing a week afterwards to the Archbishop of Glasgow, Mary's ambassador in France, was equally explicit in describing the affectionate conduct of the queen, and the strange and wayward proceedings of Darnley. He then added this remarkable sentence:

[1] Lords of the Privy-council to the Queen-mother. Keith, p. 347. The letter is dated October 8, 1566.

"It is in vain to imagine that he shall be able to raise any disturbance; for there is not one person in all this kingdom, from the highest to the lowest, that regards him any farther than is agreeable to the queen. And I never saw her majesty so much beloved, esteemed, and honoured; nor so great a harmony amongst all her subjects, as at present is, by her wise conduct; for I cannot perceive the smallest difference or division."[1]

Yet neither the temperate conduct of the queen, the remonstrances of the council, nor the neglect into which he found himself daily sinking, produced any amendment in Darnley. He persisted in his project of leaving the kingdom; denounced Lethington, the justice-clerk Bellenden, and Makgill the clerk-register, as principal conspirators against Riccio; insisted that they should be deprived of their offices; and became an object of dislike and suspicion not only to Mary, but to all that powerful and now united party, by whom she was surrounded.[2] Its leaders, Moray, Lethington, Argyle, and Bothwell, saw in him the bitter opponent of Morton's pardon. The faction of the Church hated him for his intrigues with Rome;[3] Cecil and the party of Elizabeth suspected him of practices with the English Roman Catholics;[4] the Hamiltons had always looked on him with dislike, as an obstacle between them and their hopes of succession; and the queen bitterly repented that she was tied to a wayward and intemperate person, who had already endangered her life and her crown, and was constantly thwarting every measure which promised the restoration of tranquillity and good government.

When such was the state of matters between the king and queen, disturbances broke out upon the Borders, and rendered it necessary for Mary to repair in person to these districts, for the purpose of holding courts for the trial of delinquents.[5] Her lieutenant, or warden of the Borders, at this time, was the Earl of Bothwell; and him she despatched, at the head of a considerable force, to reduce the Elliots, Armstrongs, and other offenders, to something like subjection, before she herself repaired to the spot. So far as this task went, Bothwell was well fitted for it. He was of high rank, possessed a daring and martial spirit, and his unshaken attachment to her interests, at a time when the queen had suffered from the desertion of almost every other servant, made him a favourite with a princess who esteemed bravery and fidelity above all other virtues. But unfortunately for Mary, he possessed other and more dangerous qualities.[6] His ambition and audacity were unbounded. He was a man of notorious gallantry, and had spent a loose life on the Continent, from which, it was said, he had imported some of its worst vices. In attaining the objects of his ambition he was perfectly unscrupulous as to the means he employed, and he had generally about him a band of broken and desperate men, with whom his office of Border warden made him familiar; hardened and murderous villains, who were ready on the moment to obey every command of their master. In one respect, Bothwell was certainly better than many of his brother nobles. There seems to have been little craft or hypocrisy about him, and he made no attempt to conceal his infirmities or vices under the cloak of religion. It is not unlikely, that for this reason Mary, who had experienced his fidelity to the crown, was more disposed to trust

[1] Letter from Monsieur de Croc to Archbishop Beaton, dated October 15, 1566, published by Keith, p. 346, being a translation from the original then in the Scots College, Paris.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Forster to Cecil, May 16, 1566, Alnwick. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, May 13, 1566, Berwick.

[3] Knox's History, p. 348. Glasgow edition, by M'Gavin, 1832.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Rogers to Cecil, July 5, 1566, Oxford.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Scrope to Cecil, Carlisle, October 6, 1566. Also Ibid., B.C., same to same, October 8, 1566.

[6] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, September 20, 1565.

him in any difficulty, than those stern and fanatical leaders, who, with religion on their lips, were often equally indifferent as to the means which they employed. It is certain, that from this time she began to treat him with great favour, and to be guided by a preference so predominant, that it was not unlikely to be mistaken for a more tender feeling. This partiality of the queen for Bothwell was early detected by Moray, Lethington, and their associates: they observed that his vanity was flattered by the favour shewn him by his sovereign; they artfully fanned the flame, and encouraged an ambition, already daring enough, to aspire to a height which he had never dreamt of; and it is the opinion of Sir James Melvil, who spoke from personal observation, that Bothwell's plot for the murder of his sovereign, and the possession of the queen's person, had its origin about this time, when she despatched him to suppress the disturbances in Liddesdale.[1]

After the singular scene before the privy-council and the French ambassador, the king left the court; and the queen, accompanied by her ministers and the officers of her household, set out on her progress to the Borders. At this moment these districts were in a state of great disorder; a feud raged between the Armstrongs and the Johnstons, two of the fiercest and most numerous septs in that part of the country.[2] The arrival of Bothwell, the queen's lieutenant, with a commission to reduce them to obedience, rather increased the disturbances, and in an attempt to apprehend Elliot of Park, a notorious marauder, the earl was grievously wounded, and left for dead on the field. An account of the sanguinary skirmish in which this happened, was immediately sent by Lord Scrope to Secretary Cecil. "I have," said he, "presently gotten intelligence out of Scotland, that the Earl of Bothwell, being in Liddesdale for the apprehension of certain disordered persons there, had apprehended the Lairds of Mangerton and Whitehaugh, with sundry other Armstrongs of their surname and kindred, whom he had put within the Hermitage.[3] And yesterday, going about to take such like persons of the Elliots, in pursuit of them his lordship being foremost, and far before his company, encountered one John Elliot of the Park, hand to hand, and shot him through the thigh with a dag,[4] upon which wound the man feeling himself in peril of death, with a two-handed sword assailed the earl so cruelly, that he killed him ere he could get any rescue or succour of his men."[5] Bothwell, however, though severely wounded, was not slain as at first reported, but having revived, was carried off the field to his castle of the Hermitage.

This accident happened on the 7th of October, and on the next day, the 8th, the queen arrived at Jedburgh, and opened her court.[6] The proceedings against the various delinquents who were brought before it, occupied her uninterruptedly until the 15th, on which day she rode to the Hermitage, and visited the Earl of Bothwell, who lay there confined by his wounds. The object of the visit appears to have been to hold a conference with the earl on the state of that disturbed district of which he was the governor. Mary was accompanied by Moray and others of her officers, in whose presence she communicated with Bothwell: afterwards, on the same day, she returned to Jedburgh;[7] and Lord Scrope, who immediately informed Cecil of the visit, added the precise information, that she had remained two hours at the castle, to Both-

[1] Melvil's Memoirs, pp. 170, 173. Melvil, who wrote probably from memory, erroneously places the baptism of the prince before the skirmish in Liddesdale, when Bothwell was wounded.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Scrope to Cecil, Carlisle, October 6, 1566.

[3] A strong castle in that district.

[4] A pistol.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Lord Scrope to Cecil, Carlisle, October 8, 1566. Also MS. Letter, Ibid., Sir John Forster to Cecil, October 23, 1566, Berwick.

[6] Chalmers, vol i. p. 190, 4to edition.

[7] Caligula, b. iv. 104, dorso. Fragment of a contemporary history of Mary Queen of Scots in French.

well's great pleasure and contentment.[1]

Such a visit was undoubtedly a flattering mark of regard paid by a sovereign to a subject; but he was of high rank and in high office, he had nearly lost his life in the execution of his duty, and he was a favourite with the queen.

Immediately after her return, Mary was seized with a dangerous fever, which ran its course with an alarming rapidity, and for ten days caused the physicians to despair of her life. Its origin was traced by some to the fatigue of her long ride to the Hermitage; but her secretary Lethington, with greater probability, in a letter written to Beaton, the Scottish ambassador in France, ascribed her illness to distress of mind, occasioned by the cruel and ungrateful conduct of the king.[2] "The occasion of the queen's sickness," said he, "so far as I can understand, is caused of thought and displeasure; and I trow, by what I could wring further of her own declaration to me, the root of it is the king. For she has done him so great honour without the advice of her friends, and contrary to the advice of her subjects, and he, on the other hand, has recompensed her with such ingratitude, and misuses himself so far towards her, that it is a heart-break to her to think that he should be her husband, and how to be free of him she has no outgait."[3]

During this alarming sickness, Mary believed herself dying, and an interesting account of her behaviour has come down to us from her confidential servants who were present, Secretary Lethington, the Bishop of Ross, and the French ambassador, De Croc. She expressed her entire resignation to the will of God, she exhorted her nobility in pathetic terms to remain in unity and peace with each other, employing their utmost diligence in the government of the kingdom and the education of her son; she sent her affectionate remembrances by De Croc to the French king and her relatives in that country, and declared her constant mind to die in the Catholic faith.[4] To the great joy of those around her at this moment, she recovered, and although much weakened, proceeded in her progress to Kelso, and thence by Dunbar to Craigmillar, near Edinburgh.

But if there was a recovery of bodily health, there was no return to peace of mind. During the height of her illness, the king had never come to see her, and a visit which he made when the danger was past, produced no effect in removing their unhappy estrangement.[5] At this moment her condition, as described by an eye-witness, Monsieur de Croc, was pitiable and affecting. She seemed to have fallen into a profound melancholy. "The queen," said this ambassador, writing to the Archbishop of Glasgow, on the 2d December, "is for the present at Craigmillar, about a league distant from this city. She is in the hands of the physicians, and I do assure you is not at all well; and I do believe the principal part of her

1 MS. Life of Mary Queen of Scots.— "Sa majesté fut requise et conseillé d'aller visiter en une maison appellé Hermitage, pour entendre de luy l'estat des affaires de pays de quel le dit Sieur [Bothwell] estait gouverneur hereditairement. Pour ceste occasion elle y alla en diligence, accompagne du Comte de Murray, et autres seigneurs, en presence desquelles elle communiqua avec le dit Sieur Compte, et s'en retourna le mesme jour à Jedwood, où le lendemain elle tomba malade." . . . Caligula, b. iv. 104, dorso.

Laing in his account of this visit, and the arguments he deduces from it, has implicitly adopted the mistakes of Buchanan, and derides the account of my grandfather in his Vindication of Queen Mary, which is far nearer the truth than his own. The letter of Lord Scrope to Cecil, written at the moment, and not known to either of these authors, gives us the whole truth.

2 Sloan MSS., British Museum, 3199, fol. 141. Lethington to Archbishop Beaton, Oct. 24, 1566,

3 Sloan MSS., British Museum, 3199, fol. 141. Lethington to Archbishop Beaton, Oct. 24, 1566. Outgait—way of getting out.

4 Letter, Lesley, Bishop of Ross, to the Archbishop of Glasgow, Jedburgh, Oct. 27, 1566. Keith, Appendix, No. xiv. p. 134. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Oct. 24, 1566, Lethington to Cecil; also the Council to Archbishop Beaton, Oct. 23, 1566. Keith, Appendix, No. xiv. p. 133.

5 Extract in Keith, p. 352, from a letter of De Croc's, dated 24th October 1566.

disease to consist of a deep grief and sorrow. Nor does it seem possible to make her forget the same. Still she repeats these words, 'I could wish to be dead.' You know very well that the injury she has received is exceeding great, and her majesty will never forget it. The king her husband came to visit her at Jedburgh, the very day after Captain Hay went away. He remained there but one single night, and yet in that short time I had a great deal of conversation with him. He returned to see the queen about five or six days ago; and the day before yesterday he sent word to desire me to speak with him half a league from this, which I complied with, and found that things go still worse and worse. I think he intends to go away to-morrow, but in any event, I am much assured, as I have always been, that he won't be present at the baptism. To speak my mind freely to you, (but I beg you not to disclose what I say in any place that may turn to my prejudice,) I do not expect, upon several accounts, any good understanding between them, unless God effectually put to His hand. I shall only name two: the first reason is, the king will never humble himself as he ought; the other is, the queen can't perceive any one nobleman speaking with the king, but presently she suspects some contrivance among them."[1]

At this moment, when matters between the king and queen were in so miserable a state, the faction opposed to Darnley, which was led by Moray, Lethington, and Bothwell, held a consultation with Huntly and Argyle at Craigmillar, and there proposed a scheme to Mary for putting an end to her sorrows. This was to unite their efforts to procure a divorce between her and her husband, stipulating as a preliminary that she should pardon the Earl of Morton and his accomplices in the murder of Riccio. When their design was first intimated by these noblemen to the queen, she professed her willingness to consent to it, under the conditions that the process of divorce should be legal, and that its effect should not prejudice the rights of her son. It was remarked that, after the divorce, Darnley had better live in a remote part of the country, at a distance from the queen, or retire to France. Upon which Mary relenting, drew back from the proposal, expressed a hope that he might return to a better mind, and professed her own willingness to pass into France and remain there till he acknowledged his faults. To this Maitland the secretary made this remarkable reply, hinting darkly that, rather than subject their queen to such an indignity as retiring from her kingdom, it would be better to substitute murder for divorce: "Madam," said he, "soucy[2] ye not we are here of the principal of your grace's nobility and council, that shall not find the mean[3] well to make your majesty quit of him without prejudice of your son; and albeit that my Lord of Moray, here present, be little less scrupulous for a Protestant nor [than] your grace is for a Papist, I am assured he will look through his fingers thereto, and will behold our doings, and say nothing thereto."[4] This speech alarmed the queen, who instantly replied, that it was her pleasure nothing should be done by which any spot might be laid upon her honour. "Better," said she, "permit the matter remain in the state it is, abiding till God in His goodness put remedy thereto, [than] that ye believing to do me service may possibly turn to my hurt or displeasure." To this Lethington replied, "Madam, let us to guide the business among us, and your grace shall see nothing but good, and approved by parliament."[5]

[1] Translation by Keith, from part of an original letter of Monsieur de Croc's, dated 2d December 1566, preserved at that time amongst the MSS. of the Scots College at Paris. Keith, p. vii. of his Prefatory matter.

[2] French,—mind ye not, *se soucier*.

[3] In original the *moyen*.

[4] Anderson's Collections, vol. iv. p. 192; and contemporary copy, State-paper Office.

[5] Ibid., p. 188, from a copy. Cotton MS., British Museum, Caligula, C. i. f. 282. Protestation of the Earls of Huntly and Argyle, touching the murder of the King of Scots. There is a contemporary copy,

Such was this extraordinary conversation, and it is certainly difficult to determine its precise import. It appears to me that the first part alluded solely to the divorce, and that the second proposition hinted at the murder, though darkly, yet in terms which could scarcely have been misunderstood by any who were present.[1] It is certain that the queen commanded Moray, Bothwell, and their associates to abandon all thoughts of any such design; but it had been glanced at, she was put upon her guard, and difficult or impossible as it might have been at once to dismiss these leading nobles from her councils, precautions might have been taken to defeat their abominable purpose. It is possible, however, that Mary considered her express command sufficient.

This, however, was but a feeble barrier in these cruel times. The conspiracy proceeded; and, in the usual fashion of the age, a band or agreement for the murder of Darnley was drawn up at Craigmillar, of which instrument Bothwell kept possession. It was said to have been written by James Balfour, afterwards President of the Supreme Court, and then a daring and profligate follower of this nobleman; it was signed by Lethington, Huntly, Argyle, and Sir James Balfour; it declared their resolution to cut off the king as a young fool and tyrant, who was an enemy to the nobility, and had conducted himself in an intolerable manner to the queen, and stipulated that, according to feudal usage, they should all stand by each other and defend the deed as a measure of state, resolved on by the chief councillors of the realm, and necessary for the preservation of their own lives.[2]

Soon after this, the Earl of Bedford arrived from England, to attend the baptism of the young prince; and it was remarked, that although Bothwell was a Protestant, the arrangement of the ceremony was committed to him.[3] The Scottish queen had requested Elizabeth to be godmother to her son; and this princess having appointed the Countess of Argyle to be her representative,[4] despatched Bedford with a font of gold, which she expressed some fear that the little prince might have overgrown. "If you find it so," said she, "you may observe that our good sister has only to keep it for the next, or some such merry talk."[5]

On the 17th of December the baptism of the young prince took place with much magnificence at Stirling. The ceremony was performed according to the Roman ritual, by the Archbishop of St Andrews, and the royal infant received the names of Charles James.[6]

Mary upon this occasion exerted herself to throw off the melancholy by which she was oppressed, and received

varying in a few words, in the State-paper Office.

[1] Instructions and Articles, by the Lords Huntly, Argyle, &c., to John Bishop of Ross, Robert Lord Boyd, &c., Goodall, vol. ii. p. 359.

[2] The existence of a bond for the murder of the king is proved by Ormiston's confession, (Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, pp. 511,'512,) who says he saw the bond in Bothwell's hands, and describes its contents, affirming that it was signed by Huntly, Argyle, Lethington, and Sir James Balfour, and that Bothwell told him many more had promised their assistance. This contract was, he adds, devised by Sir James Balfour, and subscribed by them all a quarter of a year before the deed was done. Ormiston in another part of his confession observes, that Bothwell broke to him the purpose for the murder on the Friday before; and when he expressed reluctance to have any concern in it, he said, "Tush, Ormiston, ye need not take fear of this, for the whole lords have concluded the same lang syne, in Craigmillar, all that was there with the queen." The same bond is minutely alluded to in a contemporary life of Mary, written in French, apparently by one of her domestics, who, although biassed, seems to have had good opportunities of observation. Caligula, book iv. folio 104, dorso. See also Answer of Lord Herries at York to Moray's "Eik," or Additional Accusation. Goodall, Appendix, vol. ii. p. 212.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Sir John Forster to Cecil, 11th December 1566, Berwick.

[4] MS. State-paper Office, ult. October 1566, Minute in Cecil's hand, from the Queen's Majesty to the Countess of Argyle.

[5] Instructions to Bedford, November 7, 1566, Caligula, book x. 384, a copy.

[6] Letter from De Croc to the Archbishop of Glasgow, Stirling, 23d December 1566. Keith, p. vii. of his Prefatory matter.

the foreign ambassadors and her noble guests with those winning and delightful manners, of which even her enemies felt the fascination; but the secret grief that preyed upon her could not be concealed. "The queen," said De Croc, writing to Beaton, the Scottish ambassador at the French court, "behaved herself admirably well all the time of the baptism, and shewed so much earnestness to entertain all the goodly company in the best manner, that this made her forget in a good measure her former ailments. But I am of the mind that she will give us some trouble as yet; nor can I be brought to think otherwise so long as she continues so pensive and melancholy. She sent for me yesterday, and I found her laid on a bed weeping sore, and she complained of a grievous pain in her side."[1]

From the baptism of his son the king absented himself, although he was then living in the palace. The causes of this strange conduct were no doubt to be found in his sullen and jealous temper; the coldness between him and the queen, and the ill-disguised hostility with which he was regarded by Bothwell, Moray, and the ruling party at court, who were now busy labouring for the recall of Morton, so recently Darnley's associate in the murder of Riccio, but now his most bitter enemy. De Croc, the French ambassador, in his letter to Bishop Beaton, describing the baptism, observed that the king's conduct at this time was so incurable, that no good could be expected of him. It is of importance to mark his expressions. "The king," said he, "had still given out that he would depart two days before the baptism, but when the time came on he made no sign of removing at all, only he still kept close within his own apartment. The very day of the baptism he sent three several times, desiring me either to come and see him, or to appoint him an hour that he might come to me in my lodgings. So that I found myself obliged at last to signify to him, that seeing he was in no good correspondence with the queen, I had it in charge from the most Christian king to have no conference with him. And I caused tell him likewise, that as it would not be very proper for him to come to my lodgings, because there was such a crowd of company there, so he might know that there were two passages to it; and if he should enter by the one, I should be constrained to go out by the other. His bad deportment is incurable, nor can there be any good expected from him for several reasons, which I might tell you, was I present with you. I can't pretend to foretell how all may turn, but I will say that matters cannot subsist long as they are, without being accompanied with sundry bad consequences."[2]

It had long been evident that Mary's enmity to the Earl of Morton and his associates, who had been banished for the murder of Riccio, was much softened; and soon after the baptism she consented to pardon them at the earnest entreaty of Moray, Bothwell, and their associates.[3] She excepted, indeed, from this act of mercy two marked delinquents, George Douglas, who had stabbed Riccio over her shoulder, and Andrew Car of Faudonside, who had presented a pistol to her breast; but Morton, Lindsay, Ruthven, and seventy-six other persons were pardoned; and so highly did the king resent and dread their return, that he abruptly left the court and took up his residence with his father, Lennox, at Glasgow. Soon after this he was seized with a disease which threw out pustules over his body; and a report arose that he had been poisoned. The rumour cannot excite wonder when we recollect the bond for the murder of the unhappy prince, which had been entered into at Craigmillar, and which its authors, who occupied the chief places about the queen, only awaited a safe opportunity to execute. But in the present case rumour spoke false, for the disease proved to be the small-pox, and the

[1] Keith, Preface, p. vii., De Croc to Beaton, from the original in the Scots College, Paris.

[2] De Croc to Beaton, Stirling, December 23, 1566, quoted by Keith in his Prefatory matter, p. vii.

[3] Bedford to Cecil, original, State-paper Office, December 30, 1566.

queen immediately despatched her own physician to attend him.[1] It was impossible, however, that he should receive much sympathy either from Mary or her ministers. His actions lately had been marked by continued perversity and weakness. Whilst the queen had been exerting herself for some months to reconcile her nobles, to secure the amity of England, and, by a judicious extension of mercy to Morton and his friends, to restore tranquillity and peace to the country, Darnley appears to have been occupied with perpetual intrigues and plots. Not contented with his secret correspondence with Rome, and the Roman Catholics in England, he was reported to entertain a project for crowning the young prince and seizing the government; and he exhibited, with his father, Lennox, a fixed resolution to thwart all the measures of the queen, and give her perpetual vexation and alarm.[2] In all these enterprises there was so much inconsistency and jealousy—so evident an inability to carry any plot into successful execution, and yet such a perverse desire to create mischief—that the queen, in addressing her ambassador in France at this moment, expressed herself towards him with much severity. "As for the king our husband," said she, "God knows always our part towards him; and his behaviour and thankfulness to us is equally well known to God and the world, especially our own indifferent subjects see it, and in their hearts we doubt not condemn the same. Always we perceive him occupied, and busy enough to have inquisition of our doings; which, God willing, shall always be such as none shall have occasion to be offended with them, or to report of us any ways but honourably, however he, his father, and their fautors speak, which we know want no good will to make us have ado, if their power were equivalent to their minds. But God moderates their forces well enough, and takes the means of the execution of their pretences from them; for, as we believe, they shall find none or very few approvers of their counsels and devices imagined to our displeasure and misliking."[3]

When this letter was written, the king, as we have seen, lay at Glasgow;[4] and, much about the same time, an incident occurred at Berwick, which appears to me to connect itself with the conspiracy to which he soon after fell a victim. In Mary's service there were two Italians, Joseph Riccio and Joseph Lutyni. Joseph Riccio was brother to the unhappy secretary David. He had arrived in Scotland soon after his brother's murder, and had been promoted by Mary to the office which it left vacant.[5] All that we know regarding him is, that the queen treated him with favour; and Lennox, after the assassination of his son the king, publicly named him as one of the murderers. Of Lutyni we know nothing, except that he was a gentleman in the queen's household, and an intimate friend of Joseph Riccio. This Lutyni, Mary now sent on a mission to France, (6th January 1566–7;) but he had only reached Berwick, when she despatched urgent letters, directing that he should be instantly apprehended and brought back to Scotland, as he was a thief, and had absconded with money.[6] Sir

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Bedford to Cecil, January 9, 1566, *i.e.*, 1566-7.

[2] Examination of William Rogers, original, State-paper Office, 16th January 1566-7. Keith, p. 348, quoting Knox in note 6. Also Mary's letter to Beaton, January 20, 1566-7, in Keith's Prefatory matter, p. viii.

[3] Mary to Bishop Beaton, 20th January, ut supra, Keith, p. viii., Preface.

[4] Bedford to Cecil, Berwick, original, State-paper Office, 9th January 1566-7. "The estate of all things there [Scotland] is as it was wont to be, and the agreement between the queen and her husband nothing amended, as you shall hear further when I come. The king is now at Glasgow with his father, and there lyeth full of the small-pocks, to whom the queen hath sent her physician."

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, April 25, 1566.

[6] Lutyni's passport is dated 6th January 1566-7, contemporary copy from original, State-paper Office, sent by Drury to Cecil, referred to in a MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., dated January 23, 1566, *i.e.*, 1566-7. He was ordered to be arrested by a letter from Mary, dated January 17, 1566-7. Transcript from original, State-paper Office, and copy of passport.

William Drury, marshal of Berwick, to whom these letters were addressed, on examining him, appears to have found upon his person, or someway to have got possession of, a letter written to him by his friend Joseph Riccio; and its contents convinced Drury that the Scottish queen dreaded the disclosure of some important secret of which Lutyni had possessed himself. Alluding to Mary's letter, and the discrepancy between the slight reasons assigned for his apprehension and her great anxiety to have him again in her hands, Drury observed to Cecil, "And therefore giveth me to think, by that I can gather as well of the matter as of the gentleman, that it is not it [the money] that the queen seeketh so much, as to recover his person; for I have learned the man had credit there, and now the queen mistrusteth lest he should offer his service here in England, and thereby might, with better occasion, utter something either prejudicial to her, or that she would be loth should be disclosed but to those she pleaseth."[1]

Riccio's letter was certainly fitted to rouse these suspicions. He told Lutyni that they were both vehemently blamed, that they were accused of acting a double part, and that Lutyni in particular was railed at as having been prying into the queen's private papers; and he implored him when examined on his return, as he valued his own safety and his friend's life, to adhere to a certain story, which he (Riccio) had already told the queen. On interrogating Lutyni, Drury found him in the greatest alarm, affirming, that if he were sent back to Scotland, it would be to "a prepared death."[2] Upon this he consulted Cecil, and received orders not to deliver him up, but to detain him at Berwick. The whole circumstances are exceedingly obscure; but it appears to me certain, from Riccio's letter, that Lutyni had become acquainted through him with some secret, the betrayal of which was a matter of life or death; that Mary suspected that he had stolen or read some of her private papers; that she had determined to examine him herself upon this point; and that everything depended on his deceiving the queen on his return, by adhering to the tale which had been already told her. In what other way are we to understand these expressions of Riccio to Lutyni? ". . . Se voi dite cosi come vi mando sarete scusato, e io ancora. La Regina vi manda ci pigliare per parlar con voi, pigliate guardia a voi che voi la cognoscete pigliate guardia che non v'abuzzi delle sue parole come voi sapete bene; e m'ha detto che vuol parlare a voi in segreto e pigliate guardia delli dire come vi ho scritto, e non altramente, a fin che nostra parola si confronti l'una a l'altra, e ne voi ne io non saremo in pena nessuna, . . . e vi prego di aver pieta di me, e non voler esser causa della mia morte."[3] When it is considered that at this moment Bothwell, Lethington, and their accomplices had resolved on the king's death; when we recollect the conference at Craigmillar, in which they had hinted their intentions to the queen, and had been commanded by her to do nothing that would touch her honour; when we know that Bothwell, who was at this time in the highest favour with Mary, was the custodier also of the written bond for the murder of Darnley, there appears to me to be a presumption that Joseph Riccio, who must have hated the king as the principal assassin of his brother, had joined the plot; that his terrors arose out of his having revealed to Lutyni the conspiracy for Darnley's murder, and that the queen, suspecting it, had resolved to secure his person. This, however, is only presumption, and the letter might relate to some other state secret. But we shall again meet with Lutyni and Riccio; and meanwhile I proceed to those dreadful scenes which so soon followed the baptism of the prince

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, 23d January 1566-7, Berwick.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, February 7, 1566-7.

[3] See the whole Letter in Proofs and Illustrations, No. XVII. It is in the State-paper Office. Endorsed in Cecil's own hand, "Joseph Riccio, Queen of Scots' servant."

and the pardon of the Earl of Morton.

When this nobleman returned in the beginning of January 1566-7, from his banishment in England, Darnley still lay in a weakly state of health at Glasgow. On his road to Edinburgh, Morton took up his residence at Whittingham, the seat of Archibald Douglas, his near relative, and soon after was joined there by the Earl of Bothwell and Secretary Lethington.[1] The object of this visit was immediately explained by Bothwell, who, in the presence of Archibald Douglas, acquainted Morton with their determination to murder the king; and added, as an inducement for him to join the plot, that the queen had consented to his death. The atrocious proposal was declined by Morton, not influenced by any feelings of horror, which, from his character, he was not likely to give way to, but on other grounds. He was unwilling, he said, to meddle with new troubles, when he had scarcely got rid of an old offence.[2] Archibald Douglas then earnestly exhorted him to join the plot; and Bothwell, in a second interview, to which Lethington was admitted, reiterated his arguments, and insisted that all was done at the queen's desire. "Bring me, then," said Morton, "the queen's handwrit for a warrant, and you shall have my answer." Upon this Douglas accompanied Lethington and Bothwell to Edinburgh, and soon after he received an order from Lethington to return to Whittingham, and tell Morton that the queen would receive no speech of the matter appointed unto him.[3] Douglas complaining of the brevity and obscurity of this message, Lethington replied that Morton would have no difficulty in comprehending it; and it appears to me certain that it related to the same subject already talked of between them,—the king's murder, and the written warrant which Morton had required from the queen.

These secret interviews and conversations took place at Whittingham and Edinburgh in the latter part of the month of January, and on the 22d of the same month Mary set out on a visit to the king at Glasgow. Darnley was now partially recovered from his late sickness, but he had received some private intelligence of the plots against him. He was aware of the return of Morton, who regarded him as the cause of all his late sufferings; he knew, that amongst his mortal enemies, who had never forgiven him his desertion of them in the conspiracy against Riccio, were some of the highest nobility who now enjoyed the confidence of the queen. He had recently heard from one of his servants that Mary had spoken of him with much severity,[4] and her visit, therefore, took him by surprise. Under this feeling the king sent Crawford, one of his gentlemen, to meet the queen, with a message, excusing himself for not waiting upon her in person.[5] He was still infirm, he said, and did not presume to come to her until he knew her wishes, and was assured of the removal of her displeasure. To this Mary briefly replied, that there was no medicine against fear; and passing forward to Glasgow, came into Darnley's bedchamber, when, after greeting and some indifferent talk, the subjects which had estranged them from each other were introduced. Darnley professed a deep repentance for his errors, pleaded his youth, and the few friends he now had, and declared to her his unalterable affection. Mary reminded him of his com-

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Morton to Cecil, from Berwick, 10th January 1566-7. MS. Letter, B.C., Drury to Cecil, January 23, 1566-7. Morton arrived at Whittingham some time between the 9th and the 23d of January.

[2] Morton's Confession in Bannatyne's Memorials, p. 317. Bannatyne edition.

[3] Morton's Confession before his death; printed in Bannatyne's Memorials, p. 318. Archibald Douglas's letter to Queen Mary, April 1568; printed from the Harleian, by Robertson, Appendix, No. xlvii.

[4] Thomas Crawford's Deposition. MS., State-paper Office. Endorsed by Cecil, but without date.

[5] Anderson, vol. iv. pp. 168, 169, and MS., State-paper Office. Thomas Crawford's Deposition.

plaints and suspicions, spoke against his foolish plan of leaving the kingdom, and recalled to his mind the "purpose of Hiegate," a name given to a plot which Darnley affirmed he had discovered, and of which he was himself to be the victim. The queen demanded who was his informer. He replied the Laird of Minto, who had told him that a letter was presented to her in Craigmillar, made by her own device, and subscribed by certain others, who desired her to sign it, which she refused.[1] Darnley then added, that he would never think that she, who was his own proper flesh, would do him any hurt; and if any others should do it, they should buy it dear, unless they took him sleeping. He observed, however, that he suspected none; and only entreated her to bear him company, and not, as she was wont, to withdraw herself from him. Mary then told him, that as he was still little able to travel, she had brought a litter with her to carry him to Craigmillar, and he declared his readiness to accompany her, if she would consent that they should again live together at bed and board. She promised it should be as he had spoken, and gave him her hand; but added, that before this he must be thoroughly cleansed of his sickness, which she trusted he shortly would be, as she intended to give him the bath at Craigmillar. The queen also requested him to conceal the promises which had now passed between them, as the suddenness of their agreement might give umbrage to some of the lords; to which he replied, that he could see no reason why they should mislike it.

When Mary left him, Darnley called Crawford to him, and informing him fully of all that had passed at the interview, bade him communicate it to his father, the Earl of Lennox. He then asked him what he thought of the queen's taking him to Craigmillar? She treats your majesty, said Crawford, too like a prisoner. Why should you not be taken to one of your own houses in Edinburgh?

"It struck me much the same way," answered Darnley; "and I have fears enough, but may God judge between us, I have her promise only to trust to; but I have put myself in her hands, and I shall go with her, though she should murder me."[2] It is from Crawford's evidence, taken on oath, which was afterwards produced, and still exists, endorsed by Cecil, that we learn these minute particulars; nor have I been able to discover any sufficient ground to doubt its truth.[3]

Soon after this interview, the queen carried her husband, by slow journeys, from Glasgow to Edinburgh, where she arrived on the last day of January.[4] It had been at first intended, as we have seen, that Darnley should have taken up his residence at Craigmillar, but this purpose was changed; and as the palace of Holyrood was judged from its low situation to be unhealthy, and little fitted for an invalid, the king was brought to a suburb called the Kirk of Field, a more remote and airy site, occupied by the town residence of the Duke of Chastelherault, and other buildings and gardens. On their arrival here, the royal attendants were about to proceed to the duke's lodging as it was called, but on alighting, Mary informed them that the king's apartments were to be in an adjoining house, which stood beside the town wall, not far from a ruinous Dominican monastery, called the Black Friars.[5] To this place she led Darnley, and making every allowance for the rudeness of the domestic accom-

[1] Crawford's Deposition, ut supra.

[2] MS., State-paper Office. Thomas Crawford's Deposition. Crawford, a gentleman of the Earl of Lennox, was examined on oath before the commissioners at York, December 9, 1568, and then produced a paper which he had written immediately after the conversations between himself and the king and queen. Wherein he did write what had taken place as nearly word for word as his memory would serve him. Anderson, vol. iv. p. 169. This paper is the Deposition, endorsed by Cecil, from which I have taken the narrative in the text.

[3] Cecil's Diary. Anderson, vol. ii. p. 271.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, Jan. 26, 1566-7. Cecil's Diary. Anderson, vol. ii. p. 272.

[5] Evidence of Thomas Nelson, Anderson, vol. iv. p. 165.

modations of these times, it appears to have been an insecure and confined mansion.[1] Its proprietor was Robert Balfour, a brother of that Sir James Balfour, whom we have already known as the deviser of the bond for the murder which was drawn up at Craigmillar, and then a dependent of Bothwell's. This earl, whose influence was now nearly supreme at court, had recently returned from Liddesdale; and when he understood that Mary and the king were on their road from Glasgow, he met them with his attendants, a short way from the capital, and accompanied the party to the Kirk of Field.[2]

At this moment the reconciliation between the queen and her husband seemed to be complete. She assiduously superintended every little detail which could add to his comfort. She treated him not only with attention but tenderness, passed much of the day in his society, and had a chamber prepared for herself immediately below his, where she slept.[3] The king was partially reassured by these marks of affection. He knew that plots had been entertained against his life, and, as we have seen, suspected many of the nobles to be his enemies. Yet he trusted to the promises of the queen, and no doubt believed that, if she remained beside him, they would find it impossible to accomplish their cruel purpose. But when he indulged these hopes, the miserable prince was on the very brink of destruction.

Since their recent meeting at Whittingham, Bothwell, Morton, Lethington, and Sir James Balfour had fully determined on the murder. The Earls of Huntly, Argyle, and Caithness, Archibald Douglas, with the Archbishop of St Andrews, and many others of the leading lords and legal officers in the country had joined the conspiracy; and some who did not choose directly to share in the plot, deemed it dangerous or impolitic to reveal it. Of this neutral sort the greatest was Moray, whom, from the evidence that yet remains, it is impossible to believe ignorant of the resolutions of his friends, but whose superior sagacity enabled him to avoid any direct connexion with the atrocious design which they now hurried on to its accomplishment.

On Sunday the 9th of February, Bastian, a foreigner belonging to the household of the queen, was to be married at Holyrood. The bride was one of her favourite women, and Mary, to honour their union, had promised them a masque. The greatest part of that day she passed with the king. They appeared to be on the most affectionate terms, and she declared her intention of remaining all night at the Kirk of Field. It was at this moment, when Darnley and the queen were engaged in conversation, that Hay of Tallo, Hepburn of Bolton, and other ruffians whom Bothwell had hired for the purpose, secretly entered the chamber which was under the king's, and deposited on the floor a large quantity of gunpowder in bags. They then laid a train, which was connected with a "lunt," or slow match, and placed everything in readiness for its being lighted. Some of them now hurried away, but two of the conspirators remained on the watch; and in the meantime Mary, who still sat with her husband in the upper chamber, recollected her promise of giving the masque at Bastian's wedding, and taking farewell of Darnley, embraced him and left the house with her suite.[4]

Soon after, the king retired to his bed-chamber. Since his illness there appeared to be a great change in him. He had become more thoughtful, and thought had brought with it repentance of his former courses. He lamented there were few near him whom he could trust, and at times he would say, that he knew he should be slain, complaining that he was hardly dealt with; but from these sorrows he had sought refuge in religion, and it was

[1] See a minute description of it in the Deposition of Nelson, printed in Anderson, vol. iv. p. 165.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Scrope to Cecil, Jan. 28, 1566-7, Carlisle.

[3] Nelson's Evidence. Anderson, vol. iv. p. 166.

[4] Nelson's Evidence. Anderson, vol. iv. p. 167.

remarked that on this night, his last in this world, he had repeated the 55th Psalm, which he would often read and sing.[1] After his devotion he went to bed and fell asleep, Taylor, his page, being beside him in the same apartment. This was the moment seized by the murderers, who still lurked in the lower room, to complete their dreadful purpose; but their miserable victim was awakened by the noise of their false keys in the lock of his apartment, and, rushing down in his shirt and pelisse, endeavoured to make his escape, but he was intercepted and strangled after a desperate resistance, his cries for mercy being heard by some women in the nearest house; the page was also strangled; and their bodies were carried into a small orchard, without the garden wall, where they were found, the king in his shirt only, and the pelisse by his side.[2] Amid the conflicting stories of the ruffians who were executed, it is difficult to arrive at the whole truth. But no doubt rests on the part acted by Bothwell, the arch-conspirator. He had quitted the king's apartments with the queen, and joined the festivities in the palace, from which about midnight he stole away, changed his rich dress, and rejoined the murderers who waited for him at the Kirk of Field. His arrival was the signal to complete their purpose: the match was lighted, but burnt too slow for their breathless impatience; and they were stealing forward to examine it, when it took effect. A loud noise, like the bursting of a thunder-cloud, awoke the sleeping city; the king's house was torn in pieces and cast into the air; and the assassins, hurrying from the spot, under cover of the darkness, regained the palace. Here Bothwell had scarcely undressed and gone to bed, when the cry arose in the city, that the Kirk of Field had been blown up, and the king murdered. The news flew quickly to Holyrood, and a servant rushing into his chamber imparted the dreadful tidings. He started up in well-feigned astonishment, and shouted "Treason!" He was joined next moment by Huntly, a brother conspirator; and immediately these two noblemen, with others belonging to the court, entered the queen's apartments, when Mary was made acquainted with the dreadful fate of her husband.[3] She was horror-struck, shut herself up in her bed-chamber, and seemed overwhelmed with sorrow.[4]

The murder had been committed on Monday, about two in the morning, and when day broke, multitudes crowded to examine the Kirk of Field. Any lengthened scrutiny, however, was not permitted; for Bothwell soon repaired to the spot with a guard, and the king's body was carried to a neighbouring house, where it lay till it was produced before the privy-council. In the brief interval, however, it had been noted that the bodies, both of Darnley and of his page, were unscathed by fire or powder, and that no blood wound appeared on either.[5]

This gave rise to innumerable contradictory reports and conjectures; but all agreed that instant inquiry promised the only hope of discovery; and men watched with intense interest the conduct of the queen and her ministers. Two days, however, elapsed before any step was taken;[6] but on the Wednesday after the murder, a proclamation offered two thousand pounds reward to any who would come forward with information; and scarce was this made public, when a paper was fixed during the night on the door of the Tolbooth, or common prison. It denounced the Earl of

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, about 18th April 1567.

[2] See the Account of M. de Moret. Proofs and Illustrations, No. XVIII. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, Feb. 12, 1566-7. Ibid., same to same, about 18th April 1567.

[3] Declaration of William Pourie. Anderson, vol. ii. p. 170.

[4] Examinations and Depositions of William Pourie, George Dalgleish, John Hay, younger of Tallo, and John Hepburn of Bolton, concerning the murder of the king. Anderson, vol. ii. pp. 165, 192, inclusive.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., February 11, 1566-7. Enclosure by Drury to Cecil.

[6] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, February 12, 1566-7.

Bothwell, Mr James Balfour, and David Chambers, as guilty of the king's slaughter. Voices, too, were heard in the streets at dead of night, arraigning the same persons; and as the fate of the king had excited the deepest indignation in the people, Mary's friends looked with the utmost anxiety to the conduct she should pursue. To their mortification, it was anything but satisfactory. Instead of acting with that spirit, promptitude, and vigour which she had so recently exhibited under the most trying emergencies, she betrayed a deplorable apathy and remissness. After keeping her chamber for some days, she removed to the seat of Lord Seaton, at a short distance from the capital, accompanied by Bothwell, Argyle, Huntly, the Archbishop of St Andrews, and Secretary Lethington.[1] On the preceding day Darnley had been buried in the chapel of Holyrood, but with great privacy. None of the nobility attended the ceremony; and it was remarked that, of the officers of state, the Justice-clerk Bellenden was alone present.

Meantime, whilst the queen was at Seaton, placards accusing Bothwell were openly exposed in the capital. The first of these appeared on the 17th, another repeated the denunciation on the 19th, and on the succeeding day, the Earl of Lennox, father to the murdered king, commenced a correspondence with the queen, in which he implored her to apprehend the suspected persons, and to lose no time in investigating the circumstances of his son's slaughter.[2] She replied that the placards contradicted each other, and that she was at a loss on which to proceed. He returned for answer, that the names of the persons suspected were notorious to the world, and marvelled they should have been kept from her majesty's ears; but to prevent all mistakes, he should repeat them: the Earl Bothwell, Mr James Balfour, Mr David Chambers, and black Mr John Spens were denounced, he said, in the first placard; in the second, Signor Francis, Bastian, John de Bordeaux, and Joseph, David's brother; and he finally besought the queen, in the most earnest and touching terms, to take order for their immediate apprehension. But he besought her in vain.[3] At the moment he was writing, Bothwell continued in high favour, and enjoyed the most familiar intercourse with Mary. Although the reports of his guilt as the principal assassin became daily stronger; nay, as if to convince Lennox that all remonstrances would be inefficacious, Sir James Balfour, the very man who was named as his fellow-murderer, was suffered to be at large.

It was at this time that Lutyni the Italian, Joseph Riccio's companion, was sent back by Drury to the Queen of Scots. Riccio himself, as we have just seen, had been accused as one of the murderers of the king; but that Lutyni's secret, of which Riccio so much dreaded the discovery, related to the plot, can only be conjectured. On his arrival the queen did not see him, (it was scarce a week after Darnley's death,) but directed that he should be examined by Bothwell. This baron was apparently satisfied with the reasons which he gave for his flight, and after a courteous interview, permitted him to return to Berwick. The queen, at the same time, sent him a present of thirty crowns; and he soon after left the country, expressing the utmost satisfaction at his escape.[4]

Had the queen entertained any serious idea of discovering the perpe-

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, Berwick, February 17, 1566, *i.e.*, 1566-7.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, February 19, 1566-7, Berwick. Also Ibid., same to same, Berwick, February 28, 1566-7. Cabala, p. 126. Norris to Cecil. Anderson's Collections, vol. i. p. 40.

[3] Anderson, vol. i. pp. 40, 44, 47, 48. Also Enclosure in MS. Letter, B.C., State-paper Office, Forster to Cecil, 28th February 1566-7.

[4] Whether guilty or no, Lutyni had been so well tutored by his friend, that no suspicion was raised. It is evident, however, that fears were felt for him, as Drury had procured a promise from Mary and Lethington, that he should be dismissed in safety; and sent a gentleman of the garrison with him, to see that it was fulfilled. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, B.C., February 19, 1566-7: Same to same, B.C., February 28, 1566-7.

trators of the murder, the steps to be pursued were neither dubious nor intricate. If she was afraid to seize the higher delinquents, it was, at least, no difficult matter to have apprehended and examined the persons who had provided the lodging in which the king was slain. The owner of the house, Robert Balfour, was well known; her own servants who had been intrusted with the keys, and the king's domestics who had absented themselves before the explosion, or were preserved from its effects, were still on the spot, and might have been arrested and brought before the privy-council.[1] But nothing of this kind took place; and in this interval of delay and apparent indecision, many persons from whom information might have been elicited, and some who were actually accused, took the opportunity of leaving the country. On the 19th of February, only nine days after the explosion, Sir W. Drury addressed an interesting letter to Cecil from Berwick, in which he mentioned that Dolu, the queen's treasurer, had arrived in that town with eight others, amongst whom was Bastian, one of those denounced in the placards. Francis the Italian steward, the same person whose name had been also publicly posted up as engaged in the murder, was expected, he added, to pass that way within a few days, and other Frenchmen had left Scotland by sea.[2]

In the midst of these events the Earl of Bothwell continued to have the chief direction of affairs, and to share with Lethington, Argyle, and Huntly the confidence of the queen. The Earls of Moray and Morton, who were absent from the capital at the time of the murder, shewed no disposition to return; and Lennox, when requested by Mary to repair to court, dismissed her messenger without an answer.[3]

Meanwhile rumour was busy, and some particulars were talked of amongst the people, which, if any real solicitude on the subject had existed, might have still given a clue to trace the assassins. A smith was spoken of in a bill fastened on the Tron,[4] who had furnished the false keys to the king's apartment, and who, on due security, promised to come forward and point out his employers.[5] A person was said to be discovered in Edinburgh, from whom Sir James Balfour had puchased a large quantity of powder; and other placards and drawings appeared, in which the queen herself and Bothwell were plainly pointed at. But the only effect produced by such intimations, was to rouse this daring man to a passionate declaration of vengeance. Accompanied by fifty guards, he rode to the capital from Seton,[6] and with furious oaths and gestures declared publicly, that if he knew who were the authors of the bills or drawings, he would "wash his hands in their blood."[7] It was remarked, that as he passed through the streets, his followers kept a jealous watch, and crowded round him as if they apprehended an attack, whilst he himself spoke to no one, of whom he was not assured, without his hand on the hilt of his dagger. His deportment and fierce looks were much noted by the people, who began at the same time to express themselves openly and bitterly against the queen.[8] It was observed that Captain Cullen and his company were the guards nearest her person, and he was well known to be a sworn follower of Bothwell's; it was remarked, that whilst all inquiry into the murder appeared to be forgotten, an active investigation took place as to the authors of the placards;[9] and minuter circumstances were noted, which seemed to argue a light and indifferent

[1] Laing, p. 52.

[2] State-paper Office, B.C., Berwick, Drury to Cecil, February 19, 1566-7. Ibid., Drury to Cecil, Berwick, February 19, 1566-7.

[3] Ibid., same to same, Feb. 19, 1566-7.

[4] A post in the public market, where goods were weighed.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, February 28, 1566-7.

[6] Seton castle, Haddingtonshire.

[7] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, Berwick, February 28, 1566-7.

[8] MS. Letter, Drury to Cecil, February 28, 1566-7.

[9] Keith, p. 374.

behaviour, at a time when her manner should have been especially circumspect and guarded. It did not escape attention, that scarce two weeks after her husband's death, whilst in the country and in the city all were still shocked at the late occurrences, and felt them as a stain on their national character, the court at Seton was occupied in gay amusements. Mary and Bothwell would shoot at the butts against Huntly and Seton; and, on one occasion, after winning the match, they forced these lords to pay the forfeit in the shape of a dinner at Tranent.[1] On the evening of the day on which the earl had exhibited so much fury in the streets of the capital, two more placards were hung up: on the one were written the initials, M. R., with a hand holding a sword; on the other, Bothwell's initials, with a mallet painted above, an obscure allusion to the only wound found upon the unhappy prince, which appeared to have been given by a blunt instrument.

These symptoms of suspicion and dissatisfaction were not confined to the people. Movements began to be talked of amongst the nobles. It was reported that Moray and some friends had held a meeting at Dunkeld, where they were joined by Caithness, Athole, and Morton;[2] and as this nobleman had absented himself from court, and kept aloof amongst his dependants, the queen became at length convinced that something must be done to prevent a coalition against her, and to satisfy the people that she was determined to institute a public inquiry into the murder.

To this, indeed, she had been urged in the most solemn and earnest terms by Bishop Beaton, her ambassador at Paris. The day after Darnley's death she had written to this prelate, giving a brief description of the late dreadful events, and lamenting that his affectionate warning, to beware of some sudden danger, had arrived too late. In his answer he had implored her to lose no time in prosecuting its authors, and vindicating herself in the eyes of the world. He had even gone so far as to repeat the common opinion then current in France, that she was herself the principal cause of the king's death, and that nothing had been done without her consent. His expressions upon this point were very remarkable. "Of this deed, if I should write all that is spoken here, and also in England, of the miserable estate of [the] realm by the dishonour of the nobility, mistrust and treason of your whole subjects, yea, that yourself is greatly and wrongously calumniated to be the motive principal of the whole, and all done by your command, I can conclude nothing besides that which your majesty writes to me yourself, that since it hath pleased God to preserve you to take a rigorous vengeance thereof, that rather than it be not actually taken, it appears to me better, in this world, that you had lost life and all . . . Here it is needful that you shew forth now, rather than ever before, the great virtue, magnanimity, and constancy, which God has granted you; by whose grace I hope you shall overcome this most heavy envy and displeasure of the committing thereof, and preserve that reputation in all godliness which you have acquired long since; which can appear no ways more clearly than that you do such justice as the whole world may declare your innocence, and give testimony for ever of their treason that have committed, without fear of God or man, so cruel and ungodly a murder."[3]

This honest letter was written on the 8th of March, about a month after the king's murder; and on the same day Mary received a message of condolence and advice from Elizabeth. It was brought by Sir Henry Killigrew, who on his arrival, after dining with Bothwell, Morton, Lethington, and Argyle, (all of them, as was afterwards proved, participated in this cruel deed,) was admitted to the

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, Berwick, February 28, 1566-7.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Keith, Preface, p. ix. Extract from the original in the Scottish College, Paris.

queen. To see her face was impossible, for the chamber was dark, but, by her voice and manner, she seemed in profound grief; and not only assured the envoy of her desire to satisfy the Queen of England's wishes regarding the treaty of Leith and the matters of the Borders, but promised him that the Earl of Bothwell should be brought to a public trial.[1]

During his stay in the capital, which lasted but a few days, Killigrew found the people clamorous for inquiry into the assassination, which they regarded as a shame to the whole nation; whilst the preachers solemnly exhorted all men to prayer and repentance, and in their pulpits appealed to God, that He would be pleased "to reveal and revenge."[2] Scarce, however, had this envoy departed, when the queen seemed to have forgotten her good resolutions; and, infatuated in her predilection for Bothwell, admitted him to greater power and favour than ever. The Earl of Mar was induced to give up the castle of Edinburgh, and it was given to Bothwell. Morton, after a secret and midnight interview with his royal mistress, received the castle of Tantallon and other lands which he had forfeited by his rebellion; and it was remarked, that in return for this, his whole power and interest were assured to Bothwell. The castle of Blackness, the Inch, and the superiority of Leith were conferred on the same favourite; and so completely did he rule everything at court, that Moray, although he judged it prudent to keep on friendly terms, became disgusted with the inferior part he now acted, and requested permission to leave the kingdom.[3]

In the midst of these transactions, it was observed that the queen was wretched. She attended a solemn dirge for the soul of her husband; and they who were near her on this occasion, remarked a melancholy change from her former health and beauty. Nor were these feelings likely to be soothed by the letters which she now received from France, in which the queen-mother and the cardinal her uncle addressed her with bitter reproaches, and declared that if she failed to avenged the death of the king their cousin, and to clear herself from the imputations brought against her, they would not only consider her as utterly disgraced, but become her enemies.[4]

Urged by these repeated appeals, she at last resolved that Bothwell should be brought to a public trial; but the circumstances which attended this tardy exhibition of justice were little calculated to justify her in the opinion of her people. He had now become so powerful by the favour of the crown, and the many offices conferred upon him, that it was evident, as long as he remained at large and ruled everything at court, no person dared be so hardy as accuse him. His trial accordingly was little else than a mock ceremonial, directed by himself, and completely overruled by his creatures. The Earl of Lennox, who at an earlier period had in vain implored the queen to investigate the murder, and to collect, whilst it was attainable, such evidence as might bring the guilt home to its authors, now as earnestly and justly pleaded the necessity of delay. He had been summoned to appear and make good his accusation against Bothwell; but he declared that it was in vain to expect him to come singly, opposed to a powerful adversary, who enjoyed the royal favour, and commanded the town and the castle. He conjured the queen to grant him some time, that he might assemble his friends; he observed, that when the suspected persons were still at liberty, powerful at court, and about her majesty's per-

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Killigrew to Cecil, 8th March 1566-7. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., 30th March 1567, Drury to Cecil, Berwick.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Killigrew to Cecil, ut supra.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, B.C., 17th March 1566-7. Same to same, 14th March 1566-7, B.C. Same to same, B.C., 21st March 1567. Same to same, 29th and 30th March 1567, B.C. See also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, 4th April 1567.

[4] Drury's letter to Cecil, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 29th March 1567, B.C.

son, no fair trial could take place; and, when all was in vain, he applied to Elizabeth, who wrote to Mary in the strongest terms, and besought her, as she hoped to save herself from the worst suspicions, to listen to so just a request. It was forcibly urged by the English queen, that Lennox was well assured of a combination to acquit Bothwell, and to accomplish by force what could never be attained by law; and she advised her, in the manage- of a cause which touched her so nearly, to use that sincerity and prudence which might convince the whole world that she was guiltless.[1]

It is not certain that the Scottish queen received this letter in time to stay the proceedings, for it was written only four days previous to the trial; and the Provost-marshal of Berwick, to whom its delivery was intrusted, arrived at the capital early on the morning of the 12th of April, the very day on which the trial took place. The state in which he found the city soon convinced him that his message would be fruitless. When he entered the palace, the friends of the Earl of Bothwell were assembled. They and their followers mustered four thousand men, besides a guard of two hundred hagbutters. This formidable force kept possession of the streets, and filled the outer court of the palace; and as the castle was at his devotion, it was evident that Bothwell completely commanded the town.

It was scarcely to be expected that a messenger whose errand was suspected to be a request for delay should be welcome; and although he announced himself to be bearer of a letter from Elizabeth, he was rudely treated, reproached as an English villain, who had come to stay the "assize,"[2] and assured that the queen was too busy with the matters of the day to attend to other business. At that moment Bothwell himself, with the Secretary Lethington, came out of the palace, and the provost-marshal delivered the Queen of England's letters to the secretary, who, accompanied by Bothwell, carried them to Mary. No answer, however, was brought back; and after a short interval, the earl and the secretary again came out, and mounted their horses, when he eagerly pressed forward for his answer. Lethington then assured him that his royal mistress was asleep, and could not receive the letter; but the excuse was hardly uttered before it was proved to be false, for at this moment a servant of De Croc's, the French ambassador, who stood beside the English envoy, looking up, saw, and pointed out the queen and Mary Fleming, wife of the secretary, standing at a window of the palace; nor did it escape their notice that, as Bothwell rode past, Mary gave him a friendly greeting for a farewell. The cavalcade then left the court, and proceeded to the Tolbooth, where the trial was to take place, Bothwell's hagbutters surrounding the door, and permitting none to enter who were suspected of being unfavourable to the accused.[3]

From the previous preparations, the result of such a trial might have been anticipated with certainty. The whole proceedings had already been arranged in a council, held some little time before, in which Bothwell had taken his seat, and given directions regarding his own arraignment.[4] The jury consisted principally, if not wholly, of the favourers of the earl; the law officers of the crown were either in his interest, or overawed into silence; no witnesses were summoned; the indictment was framed with a flaw too manifest to be accidental; and his accuser, the Earl of Lennox, who was on his road to the city, surrounded by a large force of his friends, had received an order not to enter the town with more than six in his company.[5] All this shewed too

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, 4th April 1567.

[2] The trial by a jury.—MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., 15th April 1567, Berwick, Drury to Cecil. See Proofs and Illustrations, No. XIX.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, April 15, 1567, Berwick, B.C. Also a fragment, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, undated, Drury to Cecil, April 1567.

[4] Anderson's Collections, vol. i. p. 50.

[5] Anderson, vol. ii. p. 98. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Forster to Cecil, 15th

manifestly what was intended; and Lennox, as might have been anticipated, declined to come forward in person. When summoned to make good his accusation, a gentleman named Cunningham appeared, and stated that he had been sent by the earl his master to reiterate the charge of murder, but to request delay, as his friends, who had intended to have accompanied him, both for his honour and security, had changed their resolution.[1] On this being refused to Lennox's envoy, he publicly protested against the validity of any sentence of acquittal, and withdrew. The jury were then chosen: the earl pleaded not guilty; and, in the absence of all evidence, a unanimous verdict of acquittal was pronounced. Bothwell then by a public cartel challenged any gentleman who should still brand him with the murder. On hearing of this defiance, Sir William Drury requested Cecil to intercede with Elizabeth that he might be permitted to accept it, professing himself absolutely convinced of the earl's guilt; and next day a paper was set up, declaring, that if a day were fixed, a gentleman should appear—but as no name was given the matter dropped.[2]

It was evident to all the world that this famous trial was collusive; nor could it well be otherwise. Argyle, Morton, Huntly, and Lethington were all more or less participant in the king's murder, they were the sworn and leagued friends of Bothwell, and they conducted the whole proceedings. It has been argued by Mary's advocates, that she was a passive instrument in the hands of this faction, and could not, even if willing, have insisted on a fair trial. But, however anxious to lean to every presumption in favour of innocence, I have discovered no proofs of this servitude; and such imbecility appears to me inconsistent with the vigour, decision, and courage, which were striking features in her character.

The acquittal, although countenanced by the nobles, was loudly reprobated by the common people; and as rumours began to rise of a divorce between Bothwell and his countess, a sister of Huntly, their indignation and disgust were strongly expressed. Even in the public streets, and in the queen's presence, these feelings betrayed themselves; and the market women, as Mary passed, would cry out, "God preserve your grace, if you are saikless[3] of the king's death." It was noted, too, that this daring man had insulted the general feeling by riding to his trial on Darnley's favourite horse; it was reported to Drury that the queen had sent him a token and message during the proceedings;[4] and everything must have united to shew Mary that her late conduct was viewed with the utmost sorrow and indignation. Yet, instead of opening her eyes to the perils of her situation, she seems to have resigned herself to the influence of one strong and engrossing passion; and her history at this moment hurried forward with something so like an irresistible fatality, as to make it currently reported amongst the people that Bothwell was dealing in love philtres, and had employed the sorceries of his old paramour, the Lady Buccleuch.

Immediately after the trial parliament assembled; and the queen, irritated, perhaps, at the open censures of the city, declined the ancient custom of being guarded by the magistrates and trained bands, preferring a company of hagbutters. The acquittal of Bothwell was then confirmed by the three estates, the conduct of the jury was approved of, the estates of Huntly and his friends restored, a rigid inquiry instituted against the authors of all bills in which Bothwell had been accused; and, as if to com-

April 1567. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, 15th April 1567.

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Sir John Forster to Cecil, April 15, 1567, Alnwick. Anderson's Collections, vol. ii. p. 107.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, a fragment, Drury to Cecil, April 1567. Anderson's Collections, vol. ii. p. 158.

[3] Saikless—innocent.

[4] Drury to Cecil, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., 10th April 1567, and April 19, 1567. Also April 1567. No date of the day is given, but the month is certain.

plete his triumph, Mary now selected him to bear the crown and sceptre before her when she rode to parliament.[1] It is worthy of remark also, that in this same parliament the Roman Catholic partialities of the queen seemed to be modified; and it is by no means improbable that, owing to the influence of Bothwell, who was a Protestant, the reformed party were treated with greater favour than before. Mary willingly agreed to abolish all laws affecting the lives of her subjects, on the score of their religion; she passed an act securing a provision to the poorer ministers; and it is likely more would have been granted if their Assembly had refrained from recommending a rigid inquiry into the king's murder, which she resented and declined.[2]

So completely did she espouse the cause of her profligate favourite, that although all already dreaded his power, he now received from her the lordship and castle of Dunbar, with an enlargement of his office of high admiral; and it was evident that, by the favour of the crown, and his "bands" with the greater nobles, he had shot up to a strength which none would dare to resist.[3] Moray, from his power and popularity, was the only man who could have opposed him, but he now shunned the contest. We have already seen that he had abstained from implicating himself in the bond for the king's murder: the very day that preceded it he had left the capital. Since that time he seldom attended the meetings of the council; and shortly previous to the trial, with the queen's permission, he retired to France.[4] The friends, indeed, with whom he had long and intimately acted, Morton, Argyle, Huntly, Lethington, and their associates, were all of them conspirators in the king's death;[5] and they now appeared firm adherents of Bothwell; but, in the meantime, it is certain that for some time all open intercourse between them and Moray was suspended.

After his departure the events of every day exhibited some new proofs of the infatuated predilection of the queen. Happy had it been for this unfortunate princess, had she listened for a moment to the calm and earnest advice of her ambassador at the court of France, when he implored her to punish her husband's murderers, and warned her in such solemn terms, that the eyes of Europe were fixed upon her conduct; but his letter appears to have made little impression: the collusive trial of Bothwell gave a shock to her best friends, and the extraordinary events which now rapidly succeeded confirmed the worst suspicions of her enemies.

On the evening of the day on which the parliament rose, (19th of April,) Bothwell invited the principal nobility to supper, in a tavern kept by a person named Ansley. They sat drinking till a late hour; and during the entertainment a band of two hundred hagbutters surrounded the house and overawed its inmates.[6] The earl then rose and proposed his marriage with the queen, affirming that he had gained her consent, and even (it is said) producing her written warrant empowering him to propose the matter to her nobility. Of the guests some were his sworn friends, others were terrified and irresolute; and in the confusion one nobleman, the Earl of Eglinton, contrived to make his escape; but the rest, both Papist and Protestant, were overawed into compliance, and affixed their signatures to a bond, in which they declared their conviction of Bothwell's innocence, and recommended "this noble and mighty lord" as a suitable husband for the queen, whose continuance in solitary widowhood they declared was injurious to the interests of the com-

1 Keith, p. 378.

2 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Sir W. Kirkaldy to Bedford, April 20, 1567. Ibid., MS. Letter, same to same, 8th May 1567.

3 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, B.C., April 19, 1567; also same to same, April 27, 1567.

4 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, April 9 and 10, 1567.

5 This was afterwards clearly established.

6 Anderson, vol. iv. p. 60, Elizabeth's Commissioners to the Queen, 11th October 1568, from Caligula, C. i. fol. 198

monwealth. The most influential persons who signed this disgraceful instrument were the Earls of Morton, Argyle, Huntly, Cassillis, Sutherland, Glencairn, Rothes, and Caithness; and of the lords, Herries, Hume, Boyd, Seton, and Sinclair.[1]

The perfection to which the system of paid informers was now carried in Scotland, and the rapid communication of secret intelligence to England and the Continent, have been already frequently remarked in the course of this history; but at no time did Elizabeth possess more certain information than at the present. She knew and watched with intense interest every step taken by Mary; her far-reaching and sagacious eye had, it is probable, already detected the ruin of her beautiful and envied rival, in that career of passion upon which it was now too apparent to all that she had entered; and her ministers, Cecil and Bedford, who managed the affairs of Scotland, availed themselves with indefatigable assiduity of every possible source of information. Nor did they want assistants in that country, where a party was now secretly organising for the protection of the prince and the government, against the audacious designs of Bothwell.

Of this confederacy the most powerful at this moment were Argyle, Athole, Morton, and Sir William Kirkaldy, or, as he was commonly called, the Laird of Grange, a person of great influence, reputed the best military leader in Scotland, intimately acquainted with the politics of England and the Continent, and, as we have already seen, strongly attached to the Protestant cause. The audacity and success of Bothwell naturally roused such a man, and all who professed the same principles; they justly believed that he who had murdered the father would have little scruple in removing the son; they were aware of the infamous bond for the queen's marriage, some of them indeed had signed it; and they asserted that the unhappy princess, who should have watched over the preservation of her child, was no longer mistress of her own actions. To declare themselves prematurely would have been ruin, considering the power of their opponent; they therefore secretly collected their strength, and gave warning to their friends, but determined to take no open step till they had consulted the wishes of Elizabeth.

For this purpose Grange addressed a letter to the Earl of Bedford on the day after Ansley's supper. He informed him of the miserable servitude of the nobles, and the infatuation of the queen, but assured him in strong terms, that even now, if Elizabeth would assist him and his friends, the murder of their sovereign should not long be unavenged. He enlarged on the imminent danger of the prince, and predicted Mary's speedy marriage to Bothwell, of whom he added, she had become so shamelessly enamoured that she had been heard to say, "she cared not to lose France, England, and her own country, for him, and shall go with him to the world's end in a white petticoat, before she leave him." He concluded his letter in these severe words, "Whatever is unhonest reigns presently in our court: God deliver them from their evil."[2]

This letter from Grange was soon after followed by a still more remarkable anonymous communication. Whilst Mary and Bothwell believed their secret plans were safe, their confidential agents had betrayed them to this informer, by whom instant intelligence was sent to England, that the Countess of Bothwell, Huntly's sister, was about to divorce the earl; and that the queen had projected with her favourite, that seizure of her person, in which she was to be carried with a show of violence to Dunbar. The letter which was probably addressed to Cecil is too remarkable to be omitted.

"This is to advertise you that the

[1] Anderson, vol. i. p. 107, from a copy in the Cottonian Library, Caligula, C. i. fol. 1. Keith, p. 381. There is a contemporary copy of the Bond in the State-paper Office, it is dated April 19, 1567, and bears this endorsement in Randolph's hand, "Upon this was grounded the accusation of the Earl Morton."

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Grange to Bedford, 20th April 1567.

Earl Bothwell's wife is going to part with her husband; and a great part of our lords have subscribed the marriage between the queen and him. The queen rode to Stirling this last Monday and returns this Thursday. I doubt not but you have heard how the Earl of Bothwell has gathered many of his friends, and, as some say, to ride in Liddesdale, but I believe it is not, for he is minded to meet the queen this day called Thursday, and to take her by the way and bring her to Dunbar. Judge you gif[1] it be with her will or no? but you will hear at more length on Friday or Saturday, if you will find it good that I continue in writing as occasion serves. I wald ye reif this[2] after the reading; this bearer knows nothing of this matter. There is no other thing presently to write of; but after all you will please receive my hearty commendations by him that is yours, that took you by the hand. At midnight."[3]

The intelligence given in this letter proved true. Mary, on Monday the 21st April, repaired to Stirling to visit the prince her son, and was much offended with the Earl of Mar, his governor, who, from some suspicion which he entertained, refused to allow the queen to enter the royal apartments with more than two of her ladies.[4] In the mean season Bothwell had assembled his friends to the number of eight hundred spears; and meeting her at Almond Bridge, six miles from Edinburgh, he suddenly surrounded her attendants, and with a show of violence conducted her to Dunbar, his own castle, which he had prepared for her reception.[5] In the royal cavalcade thus surprised, were Lethington, Huntly, Sir James Melvil, and some others. The three last were carried prisoners to Dunbar with the queen, the rest were suffered to pursue their journey; but when Melvil remonstrated against such usage, he was informed by Captain Blacater, a confidential servant of Bothwell's, that all had been done with the queen's own consent.[6] And it cannot be denied that everything which now happened seemed strongly to confirm this assertion.

On the 26th of April, only two days after the event, Grange addressed this indignant letter to Bedford:—

"This queen will never cease unto such time as she have wrecked all the honest men of this realm. She was minded to cause Bothwell ravish her,[7] to the end that she may the sooner end the marriage whilk she promised before she caused Bothwell murder her husband. There is many that would revenge the murder, but they fear your mistress. I am so suited to for to enterprise the revenge, that I must either take it upon hand, or else I man[8] leave the country, the whilk[9] I am determined to do, if I can obtain licence; but Bothwell is minded to cut me off, if he may, ere I obtain it, and is returned out of Stirling to Edinburgh. She minds hereafter to take the prince out of the Earl of Mar's hands, and put him in his hands that murdered his father, as I writ in my last. I pray your lordship let me know what your mistress will do, for if we will seek France, we may find favour at their hands, but I would rather persuade to lean to England. This meikle[10] in haste, from my house, the 26th of April."[11]

Mary was now swept forward, by the current of a blind and infatuated passion. A divorce between Bothwell and his countess, Lady Jane Gordon,

[1] If.

[2] "I would have you tear this."

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office; this letter, though undated, contains internal proof that it was written on Thursday the 24th April, at midnight, the day Bothwell carried off the queen to Dunbar. Cecil's Journal in Anderson, vol. ii. p. 275. Keith, p. 383.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, B.C., 27th April 1567.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, 27th April 1567. Ibid., same to same, B.C., 25th April 1567. Ibid., B.C., same to same, 30th April 1567.

[6] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 177. Bannatyne edition.

[7] Used here in the sense of forcibly to seize—*rapio*.

[8] Must.

[9] Which.

[10] Much.

[11] MS. Letter, State-paper Office. Copy of the time, backed in the handwriting of Cecil's clerk, "Copy of the Laird of Grange's letter to the Earl of Bedford."

was procured with indecent haste; and it was suspected that the recent restoration of his consistorial rights to the Archbishop of St Andrews had been made with this object. The process was hurried through the court of that prelate, and the commissariat or reformed court, in two days.[1] After a brief residence at Dunbar, under the roof of the man accused of the murder of her husband, and the forcible seizure of her person, the queen and Bothwell rode to the capital.[2] As she entered the town, his followers cast away their spears, to save themselves, as was conjectured, from any charge of treason; and their master, with apparent courtesy, dismounting, took the queen's bridle, and led her into the castle under a salvo of artillery.[3] It was a sight which her friends beheld with the deepest sorrow, and her enemies with triumph and derision.

A few days after this, Sir Robert Melvil, who had joined the coalition for the revenge of the king's murder and the delivery of the queen, wrote secretly to Cecil. His object was to warn the English minister that France was ready to join the lords against Bothwell, and to excuse, as far as he possibly could, the unaccountable conduct of his mistress. They were resolved, he said, never to consider their sovereign at liberty so long as she remained in the company of that traitor, who had committed so detestable a murder, whatever he might persuade or compel her to say to the contrary. "I understand," said he, "that the nobility are of mind to suit assistance of the queen your mistress, in consideration that the king, who is with God, as well as the queen our sovereign, and the prince her son, are so near of blood to her highness. I believe easy help shall obtain the queen's liberty, and in like manner have the murderers of the king punished. Thus far I will make your honour privy of, that France has offered to enter in band with the nobility of the realm, and to enlist the company of men-at-arms, and to give divers pensions to noblemen and gentlemen of their realm, which some did like well; but the honest sort has concluded, and brought the rest to the same effect, that they will do nothing which may offend your sovereign, without the fault be in her majesty; and it appears both Papist and Protestant join together with an earnest affection for the weal of their country." . . . He then added that Bothwell, as all thought, would soon end the marriage, and pass to Stirling to seize the prince. He entreated Cecil to consider the queen his sovereign's conduct as rather the effect of the evil counsel of those about her, than proceeding from herself; and lastly begged him to destroy his letter.[4]

Next day Grange wrote on the same subject to Bedford, and in still more striking terms. "All such things," said he, "as were done before the parliament, I did write unto your lordship at large. . . . At that time the most part of the nobility, for fear of their lives, did grant to sundry things both against their honours and consciences, who since have convened themselves at Stirling, where they have made a 'band' to defend [each] other in all things that shall concern the glory of God and commonweal of their country. The heads that presently they agreed upon is, first, to seek the liberty of the queen, who is ravished and detained by the Earl of Bothwell, who was the ravisher, and hath the strengths, munitions, and men of war at his commandment. The next head is the preservation and keeping of the prince. The third is to pursue them that murdered the king. For the pursuit of these three heads they have promised to bestow their lives, lands, and goods. And to that effect their lordships have desired me to write unto your lordship, to the end they might have your sovereign's aid and support for suppressing of the cruel murderer Bothwell, who, at the queen's last being in

[1] Keith, p. 383. Also Original State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, 2d May 1567.

[2] On the 3d of May.

[3] Anderson, vol. ii. p. 276.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Melvil to Cecil, 7th May 1567. Dated Kerny in Fife.

Stirling, suborned certain to have poisoned the prince; for that barbarous tyrant is not contented to have murdered the father, but he would also cut off the son, for fear that he hath to be punished hereafter. The names of the lords that convened in Stirling were the Earls of Argyle, Morton, Athole, and Mar. Those forenamed, as said is, have desired me to write unto your lordship to the end that I might know by you, if your sovereign would give them support concerning these three heads above written. . . . Wherefore I beseech your lordship, who I am assured loveth the quietness of these two realms, to let me have a direct answer, and that with haste; for presently the foresaid lords are suited unto by Monsieur de Croc, who offereth unto them in his master, the King of France's name, if they will follow his advice and counsel, that they shall have aid and support to suppress the Earl Bothwell and his faction. . . . Also he hath admonished her [Mary] to desist from the Earl Bothwell, and not to marry him; for if she do, he hath assured her that she shall neither have friendship nor favour out of France, if she shall have to do:[1] but his saying is, she will give no ear. . . .

"There is to be joined with the four forenamed lords, the Earls of Glencairn, Cassillis, Eglinton, Montrose, Caithness; the Lords Boyd, Ochiltree, Ruthven, Drummond, Gray, Glammis, Innermeith, Lindsay, Hume, and Herries, with all the whole West Merse and Teviotdale, the most part of Fife, Angus, and Mearns. And for this effect the Earl of Argyle is ridden in the west, the Earl of Athole to the north, and the Earl of Morton to Fife, Angus, and Montrose. The Earl of Mar remaineth still about the prince; and if the queen will pursue him, the whole lords have promised, upon their faiths and honour, to relieve him. . . .

"In this meantime the queen is come to the castle of Edinburgh, conveyed by the Earl Bothwell, where she intendeth to remain until she have levied some forces of footmen and horsemen, that is, she minds to levy 500 footmen, and 200 horsemen. The money that she hath presently to do this, which is five thousand crowns, came from the font your lordship brought unto the baptism; the rest is to be reft and borrowed of Edinburgh, or the men of Lothian. . . .

"It will please your lordship also to haste these other letters to my Lord of Moray, and write unto him to come back again into Normandy, that he may be in readiness against my lords write unto him."[2]

These important letters of Melvil and Kirkaldy, hitherto quite unknown, establish some new facts in this portion of our history. We see clearly from them that the formidable coalition against the queen, which our historians describe as arising after the marriage with Bothwell, was fully formed nearly a month before that event; that its ramifications were extensive and deep; that Sir Robert Melvil, in whom the Scottish queen reposed implicit confidence, had joined the confederacy in the hope of rescuing his royal mistress from what he represents as an unwilling servitude; that the plot was well known to Monsieur de Croc, the French ambassador, who, after having in vain remonstrated with Mary against her predilection for Bothwell, gave it his cordial support; and lastly, that it had been communicated to Elizabeth, whose assistance was earnestly solicited.

But the English princess cherished high and peculiar ideas of prerogative; and while she blamed in severe terms the conduct of the Scottish queen, she was incensed at the bold and scurrilous tone in which Grange had dared to arraign the proceedings of his sovereign. Upon this point a remarkable conversation took place between her and Randolph in the palace garden, of which, fortunately, this minister, on the same day that it occurred, wrote an account to Leicester.

[1] If she shall have to resist her enemies.

[2] Copy of the time, State-paper Office, 8th May 1567, Grange to Bedford. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Bedford to Cecil, May 11, 1567.

His expressions are forcible. "These news," said he, (meaning Mary's intended marriage,) "it pleased her majesty to tell me this day, [May 10,] walking in her garden, with great misliking of that queen's doing, which now she doth so much detest, that she is ashamed of her. Notwithstanding, her majesty doth not like that her subjects should by any force withstand that which they do see her bent unto; and yet doth she greatly fear, lest that Bothwell having the upper hand, he will rein again with the French, and either make away with the prince, or send him into France; which deliberation her majesty would gladly have stayed, but it is very uncertain how it may be brought to pass.

"Her majesty also told me that she had seen a writing sent from Grange to my Lord of Bedford, despitefully written against that queen, in such vile terms as she could not abide the hearing of it, wherein he made her worse than any common woman. She would not that any subject, what cause soever there be proceeding from the prince, or whatsoever her life and behaviour is, should discover that unto the world; and thereof so utterly misliketh of Grange's manner of writing and doing, that she condemns him for one of the worst in that realm, seeming somewhat to warn me of my familiarity with him, and willing that I should admonish him of her misliking. In this manner of talk it pleased her majesty to retain me almost an hour."[1]

It is now time that we return to the extraordinary course of events in Scotland, which fulfilled the predictions of Melvil and Grange. The Church was ordered to proclaim the banns of the queen's marriage. This they peremptorily refused. Craig, one of the ministers, Knox being now absent, alleged, as his excuse, that Mary had sent no written command, and stated the common report that she had been ravished, and was kept captive by Bothwell. Upon this the Justice-clerk brought him a letter signed by the queen herself, asserting the falsehood of such a story, and requiring his obedience. He still resisted, demanded to be confronted with the parties; and, in presence of the privy-council, where Bothwell sat, this undaunted minister laid to his charge the dreadful crimes of which he was suspected,—rape, adultery, and murder. To the accusation, no satisfactory answer was returned; but Craig, having exonerated his conscience, did not deem himself entitled to disobey the express command of his sovereign. He therefore proclaimed the banns in the High Church; but from the pulpit, and in presence of the congregation, added these appalling words:—"I take heaven and earth to witness, that I abhor and detest this marriage, as odious and slanderous to the world; and I would exhort the faithful to pray earnestly, that a union against all reason and good conscience may yet be overruled by God, to the comfort of this unhappy realm."[2]

This solemn warning, with the deep and general detestation of Bothwell, appeared to produce so little effect upon the queen, that the people considered the whole events as strange and supernatural: the report revived of this abandoned man having employed witchcraft, no uncommon resource in that age; and it was currently asserted that the marriage-day had been fixed by sorcerers.[3]

On the 12th of May Mary came in person into the high court at Edinburgh, and addressed the chancellor, the judges, and the nobility whom she had summoned for the occasion. Having understood, she said, that some doubts had been entertained by the lords, whether they ought to sit for the administration of the laws, their

[1] This letter has never before been published, but is printed in the Appendix to the anonymous privately-printed work already mentioned, entitled "Maitland's Narrative." The Appendix consists of letters and other papers relating to the history of Mary, queen of Scotland.

[2] Anderson, vol. iv. p. 280. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, May 14, 1567. Also Original, State-paper Office, May 12, 1567, B.C., Drury to Cecil.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, 12th or 13th May 1567. See also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., same to same, 20th May.

sovereign being detained in captivity at Dunbar by Lord Bothwell, she informed them that they might now dismiss their scruples; for although at first incensed at the conduct of that nobleman in the seizure of her person, she had forgiven him his offence in consequence of his subsequent good conduct, and meant to promote him to still higher honour.[1] On the same day, accordingly, he was created Duke of Orkney and Shetland, the queen with her own hands placing the coronet on his head;[2] and on the 15th of May the marriage took place at four in the morning in the presence-chamber at Holyrood. It was remarked that Mary was married in her mourning weeds. The ceremony was performed after the rite of the Protestant Church by the Bishop of Orkney; Craig, the minister of Edinburgh, being also present. In the sermon which he preached on the occasion, the bishop professed Bothwell's penitence for his former evil life, and his resolution to amend and conform himself to the Church.[3] Few of the leading nobility were present, the event was unattended with the usual pageants and rejoicings, the people looked on in stern and gloomy silence; and next morning, a paper, with this ominous verse, was found fixed to the palace gates—

"Mense malas Maio nubere vulgus ait."[4]

CHAPTER VIII.

MARY.

1567—1569.

It was not to be expected that the late appalling events would be regarded with indifference by the people, the reformed clergy, or the more honest part of the nobility. Bothwell was universally reputed the principal murderer of the king; he was now the husband of their sovereign; and it was commonly reported that he had already laid his schemes to get possession of the young prince, who was kept at Stirling castle, under the governance of the Earl of Mar. Nor are we to wonder if men even looked with suspicion to the future conduct of the queen herself. She had apparently surrendered her mind to the dominion of a passion which rendered her deaf to every suggestion of delicacy and prudence, almost of virtue. She had refused to listen to the entreaties and arguments of her best friends: to Lord Herries, who, on his knees, implored her not to marry the duke; to De Croc, the French ambassador, who urged the same request; to Beaton, her own ambassador; to Sir James Melvil, whose remonstrances against Bothwell nearly cost him his life.[5] In the face of all this she had precipitated her marriage with this daring and wicked man; and public rumour still accused her of being a party to the murder. Of this last atrocious imputation, indeed, no direct proof was yet brought or offered; but even if we dismiss it as absolutely false, was any mother who acted such a part worthy to be in-

[1] Anderson, vol. i. p. 87.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, 14th May 1567, Berwick, with its enclosure.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, May 16, 1567. Also B.C., same to the same, Berwick, 20th May 1567.

[4] The line is from Ovid. Fastorum, Lib. v. 490.

[5] Melvil's Memoirs, pp. 176, 177.

trusted with the keeping and education of the heir to the throne?

So deeply felt were these considerations, that, as we have seen, a coalition for the destruction of Bothwell, and the preservation of the prince, was now widely organised in Scotland. Of this confederacy Lethington was secretly a member, although he still remained at Dunbar with the queen. Becoming suspected, however, Bothwell and his associate Huntly had resolved on Lethington's death; when Mary threw herself between them, and declared that, if a hair of his head perished, it should be at the peril of their lives and lands. Thus preserved, he continued his intrigues, and only waited a favourable opportunity to make his escape and join his friends.[1] The plans of the associated lords had been communicated to Moray, then in France; they were sure to meet with the sanction of the Reformed Church, and the sympathy of the people. France encouraged them; and Robert Melvil and Grange, two leading men in the confederacy, had informed Cecil and Elizabeth of their intentions. Her answer was now anxiously expected.

But this princess, at all times jealous of the royal prerogative, was startled when she understood that the combined lords had not only resolved to prosecute Bothwell for the murder, and to rescue the queen from his thraldom, but to crown the prince.[2] In reply to the picture they drew of the violent restraint put upon their sovereign, she informed them that, if Mary's own letters to herself were to be trusted, she was in no thraldom, but had consented to all that had happened; she observed that "to crown her son during his mother's life was a matter, for example's sake, not to be digested by her or any other monarch;" but she added, that if they would deliver the young prince into her hands to be kept in England, she felt inclined to support them. In the meantime the Earl of Bedford was ordered to hasten northward, that he might have an eye on their[3] movements, and afford them some encouragement; whilst Cecil, her indefatigable minister, had so craftily laid his spies about the court, that he received instant information of the minutest movements of Mary and Bothwell, of the French intrigues carried on by De Croc, and of every step taken by the Lords of the Secret Council. For a brief season after their marriage, the queen and the duke appeared to forget that they had an enemy; and when Mary was informed of the private meetings of her opponents, she treated them with contempt. "Athole," said she, "is but feeble; for Argyle, I know well how to stop his mouth; as for Morton, his boots are but new pulled off" (alluding to his recent return from banishment) "and still soiled, he shall be sent back to his old quarters."[4]

In the meantime pageants and tourneys were got up to amuse the people; who observed that their queen, casting off her "mourning weed," assumed a gay dress, and frequently rode abroad with the duke, making a show of great contentment. Bothwell too was studious to treat her with respect, refusing to be covered in her presence, which she sometimes playfully resented, snatching his bonnet and putting it on his head;[5] but there were times when his passionate and brutal temper broke through all restraint; and to those old friends who were still at court, and saw her in private, it was evident, that though she still seemed to love him, she was a changed and miserable woman. On one occasion, which is recorded by Sir James Melvil and De Croc, who were present, his

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, 6th May 1567. Melvil's Memoirs, p. 178.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, 6th May 1567.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Bedford to Cecil, 11th May 1567, and copy, Elizabeth to Bedford, 17th May 1567.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, 20th May 1567.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, Berwick, 25th May 1567. Id., Ibid., B.C., Drury to Cecil, 20th May and 27th May 1567.

language was so bitter and disdainful, that, in a paroxysm of despair, she called for a knife to stab herself.[1]

About a fortnight after the marriage she despatched the Bishop of Dunblane to France and Rome; his instructions, which have been preserved, were drawn up with much skill, and contained a laboured but unsatisfactory apology for her late conduct[2] It was necessary that an envoy should be sent on the same errand to Elizabeth; and here the choice of the queen was unfortunate, for she selected Robert Melvil,[3] the secret but determined enemy of Bothwell, and one of the principal associates in the confederacy against him and herself. It is possible that this gentleman, who bore an honourable character in these times, may have considered, that in accepting this commission he should be able to serve his royal mistress; and whilst he appeared the active agent of her enemies, might secretly check the violence of their designs and labour for her preservation. But whatever may have been his motives, it is certain that he availed himself of the confidence with which he was treated, to reveal her purposes to his confederates, and in the execution of his mission acted for both parties. He received letters from Mary and Bothwell to Elizabeth and Cecil; he was instructed, as he has himself informed us, to excuse his mistress's recent marriage, and to persuade Elizabeth not to expose her to shame or declare herself an enemy;[4] and at the same moment he carried letters to the English queen, from the lords of the coalition, who accused her of the murder of her husband, and now meditated her dethronement. So completely was he judged to be in their interest, that Morton, the leader of the enterprise, described him to Elizabeth as their trusty friend, whom they had commissioned to declare their latent enterprise to her majesty.[5]

Bothwell's letter, which he sent by this envoy to Elizabeth, is worthy of notice. It is expressed in a bold, almost a kingly tone; he was aware, he said, of the queen's ill opinion of him, but he protested that it was undeserved, declared his resolution to preserve the amity between the two kingdoms, and professed his readiness to do her majesty all honour and service. Men of greater birth, so he concluded, might have been preferred to the high station he now occupied; none, he boldly affirmed, could have been chosen more zealous for the preservation of her majesty's friendship, of which she should have experience at any time it might be her pleasure to employ him. The style was different from the servility which so commonly ran through the addresses to this haughty queen, and marked the proud character of mind which, as much as his crimes, distinguished this daring man.[6]

Melvil now left Scotland (June 5) on his mission to the English court; and during his absence, the combined lords rapidly arranged their mode of attack and concentrated their forces. It was judged time to declare themselves; and the contrast between their former and their present conduct was abundantly striking. They who had combined with Bothwell in the conspiracy for the king's murder, and had signed the bond recommending him as a suitable husband for their queen, were now the loudest in their execration of the deed and their denunciations of the marriage. It was necessary for them, however, from

1 Melvil's Memoirs, Bannatyne edition, p. 180.

2 Keith, p. 388. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., 27th May 1567, Drury to Cecil. Also same to same, 20th May 1567.

3 Declaration of Robert Melvil. Hopetoun MSS.

4 Ibid.

5 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Maitland to Cecil, 21st and 28th June 1567. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Morton and the lords to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 26th June 1567.

6 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Bothwell to Elizabeth, 5th June 1567. Bothwell at the same time wrote to Cecil and Sir N. Throckmorton, by Robert Melvil. His letter to Cecil is in the State-paper Office, dated June 5, that to Throckmorton in the possession of Mr Rodd, bookseller, Great Newport Street.

this very circumstance, to act with that caution which accomplices in guilt must adopt when they attempt to expose and punish a companion. If Morton, Argyle, Huntly, Lethington, and Balfour, possessed evidence to convict Bothwell and his servants of the murder of the king, it was not to be forgotten that Bothwell could recriminate, and prove, by the production of the bond, that they had consented to the same crime. We know, too, that he had shewn this bond to some of the actual murderers; and unless they were slain in hot blood, or made away with before they had an opportunity of speaking out, the whole dark story might be revealed. These apprehensions, which seem to me not to have been sufficiently kept in mind, account for the extraordinary circumstances which soon after occurred.

Mary had summoned her nobles to attend her with their feudal forces on an expedition to Liddesdale, but most of them had already left court, and neglected the order. Huntly, who had been much in her confidence, corresponded with her enemies.[1] Lethington, the secretary, whom we have seen carried prisoner to Dunbar, pretended still to be devoted to her service, but betrayed all her purposes to the confederate lords; and at length, finding a good opportunity, suddenly left the court. Moray, it was said, had come to England, and taken a decided part against her, and Hume, one of the most warlike and powerful Border lords, was active in his opposition.[2] No army, therefore, could be assembled; so detested indeed was Bothwell, that even the soldiers whom he had in pay incurred his suspicion; and it was reported he only trusted one company, commanded by Captain Cullen, a man suspected to be deeply implicated in the king's murder.[3]

Under these circumstances of discouragement, the queen and the duke had retired to Borthwick castle, a seat of the Laird of Crookston's, about ten miles from Edinburgh, when the confederates, led by Hume and the other Border chiefs, made a rapid night march, and suddenly surrounded the place. They were nearly a thousand strong; and along with him were Morton, Mar, Lindsay, Grange, and their followers, who deemed themselves sure of their prize; but Bothwell escaped through a postern in the back wall, to Haddington. Here he remained a day in concealment, and then reached Dunbar, where he was next day joined by the queen, who fled in man's apparel, booted and spurred, from Borthwick, and thus eluded notice.[4] Disappointed in their first attempt, the confederates marched to the capital, which they reached at four in the morning, broke open the gates, took possession of the city, and published a proclamation, declaring that they had risen in arms to revenge the death of the king and the forcible abduction of their sovereign.[5] Here they were soon after joined by the Earl of Athole and the noted Lethington, a man who had belonged to all parties, and had deserted all, yet whose vigour of mind, and great capacity for state affairs, made him still welcome, wherever he turned himself. High wages were now offered to any volunteers who would come forward, and to give greater publicity to the cause for which they fought, a banner was displayed, on which was painted the body of the murdered king, lying under a tree as he had been first found, with the young prince kneeling beside it, and underneath the motto, "*Judge and*

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, B.C., 20th May 1567.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 7th June 1567, B.C., Drury to Cecil. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 16th May 1567, B.C., Drury to Cecil. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, B.C., 25th May 1567.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, B.C., 31st May 1567, with an undated Letter, probably an enclosure.

[4] Sloane MSS., Ayscough, 3199, British Museum, copy, John Beaton to his brother, 11th to 17th June. Printed by Laing, vol. ii. p. 106. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, Berwick, 12th June 1567.

[5] Anderson, vol. i. p. 131. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., 12th June 1567, Drury to Cecil. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, same to same, B.C., 14th June 1567.

avenge my cause, O Lord." The sight of this, and the tenor of their proclamation, produced a strong effect; and the confederates had the satisfaction to find, not only that the common people and the magistrates warmly espoused their cause, but that Sir James Balfour, who enjoyed the highest confidence with Bothwell, and commanded the castle, was ready to join them. This infamous man had, as we have seen, been deeply implicated in the murder, and was reported to have some secret papers regarding it in his keeping. His anticipated defection, therefore, gave new spirit to the party.[1]

Whilst such was the state of things in the city, Mary and Bothwell had assembled their followers at Dunbar, and such was the effect of the royal names that many of the Border barons and gentry deserted Hume, and joined the queen's camp. Along with them came the Lords Seton, Yester, and Borthwick, so that within a short time her force amounted to about 2000 men. With these Mary and the Duke of Orkney instantly marched against the enemy, leaving Dunbar on the 14th June, and advancing that night to Seton. Next morning she caused a proclamation to be read to the army, in which her opponents were arraigned as traitors, who for their private ends had determined to overturn the government. They pretended, she said, to prosecute the duke her husband for the king's murder, after he had been already fully acquitted of the crime; they declared their resolution to rescue herself from captivity; but she was no captive, as they who had themselves recommended her marriage with the duke well knew; they had taken arms, as they affirmed, to defend the prince her son—but he was in their own hands, and how, then, could they think him in danger? In short, all was a mere cover for their treason, and this she trusted soon to prove, by the aid of her faithful subjects, on the persons of these unnatural rebels.[2] Her next step was to intrench herself on Carberry hill, within the old works which had been thrown up by the English army previous to the battle of Pinkie.

Mary here awaited her opponents, who shewed no less alacrity to engage, marching from Edinburgh on the morning of Sunday the 15th, and taking the route to Musselburgh, which soon brought them in sight of their adversaries. Monsieur de Croc, the French ambassador, was then with the queen. He had disapproved of her marriage; and we have seen that he had even encouraged the confederates, with a view of having the prince sent to France;[3] but he now made an attempt at mediation, and carried a message to Morton and Glencairn, assuring them of their sovereign's disposition to pardon the past, on condition that they returned to their duty. "We have not come here," said Glencairn, when he heard this proposal, "to solicit pardon for ourselves, but rather to give it to those who have offended." "We are in arms," added Morton, "not against our queen, but the Duke of Orkney, the murderer of her husband. Let him be delivered up, or let her majesty remove him from her company, and we shall yield her obedience."[4]

It was evident from this reply that there was little hope of peace; and the confederate lords were the more determined, as an indisposition to fight was beginning to be apparent in the royal troops, some men at that moment stealing over to the enemy. Observing this, Bothwell, who was never deficient in personal courage, rode forward, and, by a herald, sent his defi-

[1] Beaton to his brother, from Sloane MSS., 3199. Laing, Append. vol. ii. p. 106. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Scrope to Cecil, B.C., Carlisle, June 16, 1567.

[2] Spottiswood, p. 206, Beaton to his brother, Laing, vol. ii. pp. 106, 110. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, B.C., 14th June 1567.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, B.C., 9th June 1567. Also same to same, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 31st May 1567. Also 15th June 1567, Bedford to Leicester, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C.

[4] Keith, p. 401. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Scrope to Cecil, Carlisle, 17th June 1567, B.C. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, Berwick, 18th and 19th June 1567.

ance to any one that dared arraign him of the king's murder. His gage was accepted by James Murray of Tullibardine, the same baron who had, it was said, affixed the denunciation to the Tolbooth gate; but Bothwell refused to enter the lists with one who was not his peer, and singled out Morton, who readily answered, that he would fight him instantly on foot and with two-handed swords. Upon this, Lord Lindsay of the Byres interfered. The combat, he contended, belonged of right to him, as the relative of the murdered king, and he implored the associate lords by the services he had done, and still hoped to do, that they would grant him the courtesy to meet the duke in this quarrel. It was deemed proper to humour Lindsay; and Morton presented him with his own sword, a weapon well known and highly valued, as having been once wielded by his renowned ancestor, Archibald Bell-the-Cat. Lindsay then proceeded to arm himself; and kneeling down before the ranks, audibly implored God to strengthen his arm to punish the guilty, and protect the innocent. Bothwell too seemed eager to fight, but at this critical juncture Mary interfered, and resolutely forbade the encounter.[1]

By this time it was evident that desertion was spreading rapidly in her army, nor had her remonstrances the least effect: she implored them to advance, assured them of victory, taunted them with cowardice, but all to so little purpose, that when Grange, at the head of his troops, began to wheel round the hill so as to turn their flank, the panic became general, and the queen and Bothwell were left with only sixty gentlemen, and the band of hagbutters.[2] It was his design to throw himself between Dunbar and this little force, thus cutting off Bothwell's escape; but Mary perceived it, and sent the Laird of Ormiston to demand a parley. This was immediately granted, and when Grange rode forward, he assured his sovereign of their readiness to obey her, if that man who now stood beside her, and was guilty of the king's murder, were dismissed. To this she replied, that if the lords promised to return to their allegiance, she would leave the duke and put herself in their hands. He carried this message to his brethren, and came back with a solemn assurance that, on such conditions, they were ready to receive and obey her as their sovereign. Hearing this, the queen, ever too credulous and apt to act on the impulse of the moment, held a moment's conversation aside with Bothwell. What passed can only be conjectured; he appeared to waver, and remonstrate, but when she gave him her hand, he took farewell, turned his horse's head and rode off the field, none of the confederates offering the least impediment.[3] It was the last time they ever met.

Mary now waited for some time till he was out of danger, and then, coming forward, exclaimed: "Laird of Grange, I surrender to you on the conditions you have specified in the name of the lords." That baron then took her hand, which he kissed; and holding her horse's bridle, conducted her down the hill to the confederates. On reaching the lines, she was met by the nobles, who received her on their knees. "Here, madam," said Morton, "is the true place where your grace should be; and here we are ready to defend and obey you as loyally as ever nobility of this realm did your progenitors." So fully felt was this senti-

[1] Copy of the time, State-paper Office, Haryson to Cecil, probably June 16, 1567. The name is scored out but readable. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, June 19, 1567, with enclosure. Calderwood, MS. History, Ayscough, 4735, p. 668. Also Spottiswood, p. 207.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Scrope to Cecil, June 17, 1567.

[3] Raumer, quoting De Croc's Despatches, pp. 100, 101. De Croc says in his letter to Catherine de Medici, "Bothwell became greatly alarmed, and at last asked the queen whether she would keep the promise of fidelity which she had made to him. She answered yes, and gave him her hand upon it. He then mounted his horse, and fled with a few attendants." All this, however, must, as I have said, be conjecture. De Croc was not present: after his unsuccessful attempt at mediation, he had retired to Edinburgh. Spottiswood, p. 207.

ment, that when some of the common soldiers began to utter opprobrious language, Grange drew his sword and compelled them into silence.

Such was the extraordinary scene which led to the escape of Bothwell, and it demands a moment's reflection. The confederate nobles had declared that their object in taking arms was to bring this infamous man to justice, as the murderer of the king; yet, at the moment when they had him in their power, he was permitted to escape. Nothing could appear more inconsistent; and yet, perhaps, looking to the motives which have been already pointed out, it will not be found unnatural. He, indeed, was the principal murderer, but Morton, Huntly, Lethington, and Argyle were aware that, if driven to his defence, he could bring them in as accomplices. They allowed him to escape, because he was infinitely more easily dealt with as a fugitive than as a prisoner.

But to return to Mary. Encouraged by the first appearances of courtesy, she declared her wish to communicate with the Hamiltons, who, the night before, had advanced in considerable strength to Linlithgow. This was peremptorily refused, upon which she broke into reproaches, appealed to their promise, and demanded how they dared to treat her as a prisoner! Her questions and her arguments were unheeded, and she now bitterly repented her precipitation. Her spirit, however, instead of being subdued, was rather roused by their baseness. She called for Lindsay, one of the fiercest of the confederate barons, and bade him give her his hand. He obeyed. "By the hand," said she, "which is now in yours, I'll have your head for this."[1] Unfortunate princess! When she spoke thus, little did she know how soon that unrelenting hand, which had been already stained with Riccio's blood, would fall still heavier yet upon herself.

It was now evening, and the queen, riding between Morton and Athole, was conducted to the capital, where she awoke to all the horrors of her situation.[2] She was a captive in the hands of her worst enemies: the populace, as she rode through the streets, received her with yells and execrations; the women pressing round, accused her in coarse terms as an adulteress stained with her husband's blood; and the soldiers, unrestrained by their officers, kept constantly waving before her eyes the banner on which was painted the murdered king, and the prince crying for vengeance. At first they shut her up in the provost's house, where she was strictly guarded. It was in vain she remonstrated against this breach of faith; in vain she implored them to remember that she was their sovereign: they were deaf to her entreaties, and she was compelled to pass the night, secluded even from her women, in solitude and tears. But the morning only brought new horrors. The first object which met her eyes was the same dreadful banner, which, with a refinement in cruelty, the populace had hung up directly opposite her windows. The sight brought on an agony of despair and delirium, in the midst of which she tore the dress from her person, and, forgetting that she was almost naked, attempted in her frenzy to address the people.[3] This piteous spectacle could not be seen without producing an impression in her favour; and the citizens were taking measures for her rescue, when she was suddenly removed to Holyrood. Here a hurried consultation was held, and in the evening she was sent a prisoner to Lochleven, a castle situated in the midst of a lake, belonging to Douglas, one of the confederates, and from which escape was deemed impossible. In her journey thither, she was treated with studied indignity, exposed to the gaze of the mob, miserably clad, mounted on a sorry hackney, and

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, B.C., June 18, 1567. Also copy, State-paper Office, probably June 16, 1567, Haryson to Cecil.

[2] Letter of John Beaton to his brother, Sloane MSS., Ayscough, 3199, printed by Laing, vol. ii. p. 106.

[3] John Beaton to his brother, 17th June 1567, Laing, vol. ii., Appendix, p. 106.

placed under the charge of Lindsay and Ruthven, men of savage manners, even in this age, and who were esteemed peculiarly fitted for the task.[1] Against this base conduct it is said that Grange loudly remonstrated, and that, to silence his reproaches, the lords produced an intercepted letter, written by the queen from her prison in Edinburgh to Bothwell, in which she assured him that she would never desert him. The story is told by Melvil, but I have found no trace of it; and Grange had already manifested such bitter hostility to his sovereign, that his sincerity may be questioned, especially as he continued to act with his former associates.[2]

Thus far the measures of the confederates were crowned with success. The queen was a prisoner in their hands; they were possessed of the person of the heir-apparent, who had been committed to the governance of Mar, one of their principal leaders; Bothwell was a fugitive, and they were sustained in everything they had done by the support of the ministers of the Reformed Church, and by the general voice of the people. For the present, therefore, all was deemed secure; and, on considering their future policy, they determined to pause till it was seen with what feelings the late events were regarded by England and France. With this view they lost no time in despatching letters, first to Elizabeth, and after a little interval to the King of France. To the English queen they declared that their only motive in taking up arms had been the punishment of the king's murder; they assured her that, so soon as this was accomplished, their sovereign should be restored to freedom; and as for the coronation of the young prince, that such an idea had never been contemplated. In conclusion, they expressed a hope that she would consider their want of money, and send them the sum of three or four thousand crowns to hire soldiers, in return for which they were ready to refuse the offers of France, and submit to be wholly guided by England.[3]

To France their letters were full of amity, but more general and guarded. De Croc, the ambassador, had at once perceived the advantage of securing the friendship of the successful party. Although pretending a great zeal for Mary's service, he really favoured the confederates, and had not only proposed that the young prince should be brought up under the care of the king his master, but advised them to keep the Queen of Scots securely, now that they had her in their hands.[4] To him the confederates gave fair words, but prudently determined not to commit themselves till they heard more definitively from England. They at the same time entered into communication with Moray and the Earl of Lennox, whose presence they required in Scotland.[5]

At this crisis, (June 20,) according to the evidence of Cecil's journal, which has been, on insufficient grounds I think, suspected of forgery, the Lords of the Secret Council, through the treachery of a servant of Bothwell's, became possessed of a box or casket, which was said to contain some private letters and sonnets addressed by the queen to the duke. This was that celebrated silver casket, which afterwards made so much noise, and in which, as asserted by the enemies of Mary, were found decided proofs of her guilt. The whole details connected with the story are suspicious; nor is it the least suspicious of these circumstances, that in the confidential letters of Drury to Cecil, written at this period from day to day, and em-

[1] John Beaton to his brother, 17th June 1567, Laing, vol. ii., Appendix, p. 106. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, B.C., June 18, 1567.

[2] Melvil's Memoirs, Bannatyne edition, p. 185.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Sir John Forster to Cecil, June 20, 1567. The messenger's name was John Rede, with Instructions enclosed. Also State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, June 20, 1567. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Bedford to Cecil, June 23, 1567.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., June 20, 1567.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, B.C., July 9, 1567. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., July 12. Same to same, and July 19, Scrope to Cecil.

bracing the most minute information of everything which passed, there is no allusion to such a seizure. It is, however, to be remembered that Morton, Lethington, and Sir James Balfour, the three great leaders of the confederacy, were themselves deeply implicated in the assassination of Darnley, and that they would be exceedingly likely to suppress such a discovery, till the contents of the casket were rigidly examined. They knew that Bothwell was in possession of the bond for the king's murder, and the casket might contain it, or other papers equally conclusive. It is certain that, on the day of this reported discovery, (June 20,) Morton and his associates despatched George Douglas, one of the most confidential of their number, on a secret mission to the Earl of Bedford, and it is possible his message may have related to it.[1] In this mysterious state we must leave the matter at present.

On hearing of the late extraordinary events in Scotland, Elizabeth's feelings were of a divided kind. Her ideas of the inviolability of the royal prerogative were offended by the imprisonment of the queen. However great were Mary's faults, or even her guilt, it did not accord with the high creed of the English princess that any subjects should dare to expose or punish them; and we have seen that, in a former conversation with Randolph, she alluded to Grange's letters to Bedford in terms of much bitterness.[2] But notwithstanding this, she was fully alive to the necessity of supporting a Protestant party in Scotland; and she well knew that nothing could so effectually promote her views, as to induce the confederate lords to refuse the offers of France, and deliver to her the young prince to be educated in Protestant principles at the court of England. Nor was she ignorant that the able and crafty men who directed their proceedings, had determined to refuse every petition for the restoration of their sovereign to liberty, an event probably as much deprecated by Elizabeth as by themselves.[3] It was perfectly safe for the English queen, therefore, to give fair promises to Mary, and to remonstrate with the confederates upon this subject. Such being her views, she despatched Robert Melvil, who was then in England, with a letter to his mistress; and ordered Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, one of her ablest diplomatists, to hold himself in readiness to proceed on a mission to Scotland.

Meanwhile the Lords of the Secret Council, who had suffered the principal actor in the king's murder to escape, became active in their search for inferior delinquents. Captain Cullen, a daring follower of Bothwell's, had been seized on their first advance to Edinburgh, and soon after two others, Captain Blacater and Sebastian de Villours, were apprehended. The foreigner was soon discharged, but Blacater was tried for the murder, convicted, and executed before an immense concourse of spectators who eagerly surrounded the scaffold. To their disappointment he died solemnly calling God to witness his innocence, and revealed no particulars.[4] Of Cullen, who, it was reported, on his apprehension, had discovered the whole details of the conspiracy, we hear no more. It is possible he may have been commanded to say nothing, because he might have told too much.

These efforts of the confederates to bring the guilty to justice did not satisfy the people; it was suspected that amongst their leaders were some who dreaded any strict examination; and Morton and Lethington, distrusting the fickle nature of the lower classes, began to dread a reaction in the queen's favour. This was the more alarming, as the rival faction of the Hamiltons had recently mustered

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Bedford to Cecil, B.C., June 23, 1567. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Morton and the Lords to Bedford, June 20, 1567.

[2] Randolph to Leicester, May 10, 1567. See supra, p. 250.

[3] Gonzalez Apuntamientos, p. 322. Memorias de la Real Acad. de la Historia, vol. vii.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, B.C., June 25; also B.C., June 27, 1567, same to same. Also, Historie of James the Sext, p. 15, Bannatyne edition.

in great strength. The head of this party was nominally the Duke of Chastelherault, now in France, but really his brother, the Archbishop of St Andrews. Failing Mary and her son, the duke was next heir to the throne; and he and his advisers had acuteness enough to penetrate into the views of Morton and his party. They saw clearly that the consequence of the continued captivity of their sovereign, must be the coronation of the young prince, his protection by Elizabeth, and the establishment of a regency, under which Lennox, Morton, or Moray, would engross the whole power of the state. Having been generally opposed to Mary and her marriage, her captivity was not in itself a matter which gave them any very deep concern; but in weighing the two evils, its continuance and a regency, or her restoration and a third marriage, they chose what they thought the least, and determined to make an effort for her restoration.

For this purpose a convention of the lords of their party was held at Dumbarton, (June 29,) and proclamation made for all good subjects to be ready, on nine hours' warning, to take arms for the delivery of the queen.[1] They were here joined by Argyle and Huntly, who had deserted the confederates; by Herries, a baron of great power and vigour of character; and by Crawford, with the Lords Seton and Fleming; whilst the Archbishop of St Andrews, and the celebrated Lesley, bishop of Ross, directed their councils.[2] Their deliberations were watched and reported to his court by De Croc, the French ambassador, who found them, as was to be anticipated, more inclined to France than England.[3]

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil. He states that "the confederates are very anxious for Lennox's return into Scotland, *to beard the Hamiltons.*" June 20, 1567. Also same to same, June 25, 1567, State-paper Office, B.C. Also same to same, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., June 29; and same to same, July 1, 1567, B.C.

[2] Bond signed by the Convention at Dumbarton, June 29, 1567, copy, State-paper Office, and printed by Keith, p. 436.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, B.C., June 29, 1567.

It was not to be expected that the Lords of the Secret Council could view such proceedings without anxiety, and they thought it prudent to strengthen themselves by a more intimate union with the party of the Reformed Church. Here, indeed, was their strongest hold; for the Reformed clergy were sternly opposed to the queen, they firmly believed that she was participant in the king's murder, and they possessed the highest influence with the people.

On their taking possession of the capital, immediately after their unsuccessful attempt at Borthwick, Glencairn, one of the fiercest zealots of these times, had signalised his hatred of Popery by an attack upon the royal chapel at Holyrood, in which he demolished the altar, and destroyed the shrines and images. This attack, although condemned by some of the party, was not unwelcome to the ministers, and on the 25th of June an assembly of the Church was held at Edinburgh. In this meeting of his friends and brethren, John Knox reappeared. This great leader of the Reformed Church had fled, as we have seen,[4] from the capital immediately after the assassination of Riccio, and had deemed it unsafe to return till the queen was imprisoned in Lochleven. Of his history in this interval we know little; he probably resided chiefly with his relatives in the neighbourhood of Berwick, and he was in England at the time of the king's murder;[5] but about a month after that event, he again entered into communication with Bedford and Cecil:[6] and now that all fear from the animosity of the queen was at an end, and the chief power in the government once more in the hands of his friends, he again took his part in the discussions which agitated the country.

In his retirement he appears to have lost nothing of his wonted fire. He was animated by the same stern, uncompromising, and unscrupulous

[4] Supra, p. 223.

[5] M'Crie's Life of Knox, p. 259.

[6] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Bedford to Cecil, March 11, 1566-7.

spirit as before, and the crisis appeared to him to be highly favourable for the complete demolition of Popery, and the permanent establishment of the Protestant faith. Henceforward we must regard him as the leader of the Reformed Church; and upon certain conditions he declared himself ready to give his cordial assistance to the confederates. He stipulated that they should recognise the parliament held at Edinburgh in 1560, and its acts as laws of the realm. It will be recollected that this was the famous parliament in which Popery had been overthrown, and the reformed religion established; and that, notwithstanding all the efforts of Elizabeth and the Protestants, Mary had never given her consent to its decrees. The confederates, who were mostly, if not all, Protestants, of course experienced no such scruples, but embraced the proposal at once, and entered into the strictest union with Knox and his party. Nor was this all. They agreed to restore the patrimony of the Church, which had been seized and devoted to civil uses; to intrust the education of youth in all colleges and public seminaries to the reformed clergy; to put down idolatry (so they denominated the Roman Catholic faith) by force of arms, if necessary; to watch over the education of the prince, committing him to some godly and grave governor; and to punish to the uttermost the murderers of the king.[1] In return for this, Knox adopted the cause of the Lords of the Secret Council (such was the title by which the confederacy against Mary and Bothwell was now known) with all the energy belonging to his character. From former experience, none knew better than this extraordinary man the strength of popular opinion when once roused, and few understood better how to rouse it by that style of pulpit eloquence which he had adopted:—earnest, sententious, satirical, colloquial, often coarse, but always to the point, and always successful. There can be little doubt, I think, that the great secondary cause of the establishment of the Reformation in Scotland was the force of popular opinion, roused, directed, and kept in continual play, by the sermons and addresses of the clergy. Such an engine was not permitted in England by Elizabeth and her ministers: Knox regretted it, and repeatedly requested licence to preach at Berwick, but he was invariably refused.

An attempt was made at this time to bring over the Hamiltons and their associates to the confederates;[2] and letters were written in the name of the Church to Argyle, Huntly, Herries, and others, requesting their presence at Edinburgh on the 20th July, to which day they had adjourned their Assembly. To enforce this, Knox, with three colleagues, Douglas, Row, and Craig, waited upon them, and urged the necessity of their attendance, that they might labour for the re-establishment of the policy and patrimony of the Church. But the Hamiltons suspected the overtures; and the Secret Council, who dreaded lest delay should give strength to their enemies, determined to compel the queen to abdicate the government in favour of the prince her son.

The known character of Mary, however, rendered this daring resolution a matter of no easy accomplishment. Her confinement in Lochleven had been accompanied with circumstances of great rigour; she was there placed under the charge of Lindsay and Ruthven, men familiar with blood, and of coarse and fierce manners. The lady of the castle, Margaret Erskine, daughter of Lord Erskine, had been mistress to the queen's father, James the Fifth, and was mother to the Earl of Moray. She had been afterwards married to Sir Robert Douglas; and their son, William Douglas, who was proprietor of the castle, had early joined the con-

[1] Knox, History, p. 449. Spottiswood, p. 210. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, B.C., Berwick, June 25, 1567. Also MS. Letter, B.C., June 27, 1567, same to the same.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Berwick, Drury to Cecil, June 25, 1567.

federacy. She herself is said to have been a woman of a proud and imperious spirit, and was accustomed to boast that she was James's lawful wife, and her son Moray, his legitimate issue, who had been supplanted by the queen.[1]

Under such superintendents, Mary could not expect a lenient captivity; but her spirit was unbroken, though Villeroy, a gentleman sent to her by the King of France, was denied all access, and it became impossible for her to receive advices of the proceedings of the Hamiltons, from the strictness with which all communication was cut off.[2] She had sent, as we have seen, Robert Melvil on a mission to the English queen soon after her marriage. During his stay in England those sad calamities had occurred with which we are acquainted; and now that she was a prisoner, shut out from all friendly intercourse, and fed only with the deferred hopes that sicken the heart, she looked anxiously for his return.

But this servant had, as we have seen, become the envoy of her enemies. During his stay in England he had acted as the secret agent of the confederate lords, who had imprisoned her; he solicited money to support them in their enterprise; he received orders from them to supply himself out of this sum when it was advanced by Elizabeth; he was cautioned against declaring himself too openly, as something had come to the ears of the French ambassador:[3] he proposed to the English queen the project for Mary's "demitting the crown" in favour of her son, with which the lords who had imprisoned her had made him acquainted; and, on his arrival in Edinburgh, his first meeting was neither with his own sovereign nor the friends who had combined for her delivery, but with the Lords of the Secret Council. He assured them of the support of the English queen in the "honourable enterprise" in which they had engaged; he informed them that Elizabeth had agreed to Mary's resignation of the crown, provided it came of her own consent; and he then, before visiting his mistress in her prison at Lochleven, addressed a letter to Cecil, from which, as it contains his own account of his negotiation, I think it right to give this extract:—"It may please your honour," says he, "to be advertised, I came to this town [Edinburgh] upon the 29th of June, and have[4] imparted the queen's majesty's good disposition in the assisting and partaking with the lords to prosecute the murderers of the king, and to preserve the prince in the custody of the Earl of Mar. Whereof the said lords most humbly thank her highness. The whole particularities that I had your honour's advice in, according to the queen your sovereign's meaning, is not at this present resolved on, by reason the most part of noblemen are gone to their houses, to repose them and their friends, except the Earls of Morton and Athole, with my Lord Hume, my Lord Lethington, Sir James Balfour, captain of the castle, who is daily in council with them, and Mr James Makgill and the justice-clerk. The cause of their going from this town is by some bragging of the Hamiltons, with the Earl of Huntly, minding to convene their forces and make their colour [pretence] for the delivery of the queen; albeit, it be credibly reported that they fear the king's murder to be laid to some of their charges; I mean the Bishop of St Andrews: wherefore, it was thought most convenient that the noblemen and gentlemen should in the meantime have their friends in readiness.

"Before my coming, the lords did write divers instructions unto me, besides a letter written to the queen's

[1] Keith, p. 403, note 6.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, 27th June, 1567. Also Ibid., same to same, June 20, 1567.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Melvil to Cecil, 1st July 1567; also MS. Letter, Melvil to Cecil, June, 1567; and MS. Letter, in cipher with the decipher affixed, David Robertson to Melvil, June 26, 1567; also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Earls of Athole, Morton, and others, to Elizabeth, 26th June, 1567.

[4] In Orig. "has."

majesty,[1] subscribed by them. The effect whereof was, that as they did understand by me of the good inclination [of] your mistress and council being addicted to help them in their most need,—so, for their parts, their goodwill to do her majesty service, before all other, with time shall be declared. As for their dealing with France, they have used them so discreetly, as neither France may have any just cause to be offended, and the queen your sovereign be well pleased.

"The lords presently needs but money, for they have already listed divers men of war, and is taking up more. The Hamiltons is judged to be maintained by the queen's[2] substance, and countenanced by France to have money, seeing France is in doubt to persuade our noblemen. Wherefore, sir, it is most needful that with all expedition money may be procured of the queen your sovereign, and sent thither with Sir Nicholas Fragmarton,[3] or by some of the Borders, for that necessity that they will be prest to, will be within eight or ten days, which I thought meet to advertise your honour of; and what order shall be taken for my going to the queen is not agreed upon, by reason the most part of lords are not present; and my Lord Lethington being greatly empesched with affairs, might not have leisure to concur at length, but is glad to understand of the care your honour has that we should do all things by justice and moderation. And that the queen your sovereign may be content with your conference with me, he does well like of your advice in divers heads; always, there is matter enough probable[4] to proceed upon that matter we first agreed upon, and farther is thought expedient. Ye shall with diligence be advertised; and refers the rest to my Lord of Lethington's letter, who does repose himself upon the care he hopes your honour will continue in, for to set forward their honourable enterprise; and the lords, for their part, will accord with your ambassador to keep the prince: and to her highness' desire will put him in the custody of her majesty, if at any time hereafter they shall be minded to suffer him go in any other country. The whole novels[5] here I refer to my Lord of Lethington's letter; and as I learn further your honour shall be advertised. . . : At Edinburgh the 1st of July. R. Melvil."[6]

This letter sufficiently explains itself, and proves that Melvil, although nominally the envoy of Mary, was now acting for the confederates. It unveils, also, the real intentions of Elizabeth; it shews that her object in despatching her ambassador, Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, was professedly to procure the queen's liberty; but really to encourage the confederates, to attach them to her service, to obtain possession of the prince if possible, to induce the captive queen to resign the crown, and to hold out to Moray, with whom she, Melvil, and the Lords of the Secret Council were now in treaty, the hope of returning to his country and becoming the chief person in the government.[7] It appears to me also, (but this is conjecture,) that the mysterious sentence[8] in which Melvil informs Cecil that Lethington liked his advice, and that at any rate they had proof enough to proceed on the matter first agreed upon, related to the scheme of compelling their sovereign to agree to their wishes by a threat of bringing her to a public trial for the murder of the king.

On the same day on which this letter was written (July 1) Melvil repaired to Lochleven, and was admitted to an interview with Mary, in which he delivered to her the letter of the

[1] Elizabeth.
[2] Mary's.
[3] Sir N. Throckmorton.
[4] Probable here used in the sense of *provable*.
[5] Novels—news.
[6] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Robert Melvil to Cecil, Edinburgh, 1st July 1567.
[7] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, R. Melvil to Cecil, July 8, 1567. Kerny in Fife.
[8] "He [Lethington] does well like of your advice in divers heads; always there is matter enough probable [provable] to proceed upon that matter we first agreed upon, and farther is thought expedient."

Queen of England. At this conference Lindsay, Ruthven, and Douglas insisted on being present, according to the orders which they had received from the Lords of the Secret Council. The queen was thus cut off from all private conference with her servant, and she complained bitterly of such rigour, but could obtain no redress. Eight days afterwards, however, Melvil was again sent by them to Lochleven, and permitted to see his royal mistress alone. In this interview he endeavoured (according to his own declaration[1]) to persuade Mary to renounce Bothwell, but this she peremptorily refused; and her obduracy upon this point excited the utmost indignation in the lords and the people. Knox, now all powerful with the lower ranks, thundered out, as Throckmorton expressed it to Cecil, *cannon-hot* against her; and so thoroughly convinced were his party, and some of the leaders, of her guilt, that it became generally reported she would be brought to a public trial. So much was this the case, that early in July Lord Herries held a meeting with Lord Scrope, in which, when the English warden attempted to detach him from Mary's interests, he declared that, if Morton and his faction would set his mistress at liberty, he was ready to assist them in prosecuting Darnley's murderers; but if they intended to bring the queen to her trial by open assize, he would defend her, though forsaken by all the world.[2]

In the meantime Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, Elizabeth's ambassador, left the English court on his mission to Scotland. We have seen that the English queen, in her message to Morton and his confederates, by Robert Melvil, had encouraged them in their enterprise, and promised them her support; but her instructions to Throckmorton, although severely worded, were more favourable to the captive queen. He was directed, indeed, to express her grief and indignation that decided steps had not been taken for the punishment of the king's murder, to point out the mortal reproach she had incurred by her marriage, and to assure her that at first she had resolved to give up all farther communication with one who seemed by her acts so reckless of her honour; but he was instructed to add that the late rebellious conduct of her nobles had softened these feelings. Whatever had been Mary's conduct, it did not (she said) belong to subjects to assume the sword, or to punish the faults of the prince; and so much did she commiserate and resent her imprisonment, that she was prepared to compel her nobles to restore her to liberty. At the same time she was ready to lend her countenance and assistance for the prosecution of the king's murder, and the preservation of the young prince. In conclusion, Throckmorton was enjoined to declare to the Scottish queen the charges with which she was loaded by her subjects, and to hear her answers and defence.[3]

On crossing the Border, the ambassador was met by Lethington, the secretary, at Coldingham, who conducted him to Fastcastle, a strong fortalice overhanging the German Ocean.[4] Here he was received by Hume, the lord of the castle, with Sir James Melvil; and in a conference held with the Scottish secretary, it was soon apparent that he had to deal with those who were as crafty, cautious, and diplomatic as himself or his mistress. On the same day he wrote to Cecil, and informed him that the Scottish lords dreaded Elizabeth's caprice. They assured themselves, he said, "that if they ran her fortune, she would leave them in the briars," and desert them after they had com-

[1] Robert Melvil's Declaration, Hopetoun, MSS. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Sir James Melvil to Drury, Edinburgh, 8th July 1567.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Scrope to Cecil, B.C., Carlisle, 9th July 1567.

[3] British Museum, Cotton MSS., Caligula, C. i. f. 3, 6, 8. Copy, Instructions to Sir N. Throckmorton, 30th June 1567.

[4] Robertson's Appendix, No. xxii., Throckmorton to Cecil, 12th July 1567. Fastcastle is described by him as "very little and very strong: a place fitter to lodge prisoners than folks at liberty."

mitted themselves. Already they complained that she had departed from her first promises to Robert Melvil, and had sent a cold answer to their last letter; and as for her proposal to set their sovereign at liberty, if sincere in this, it was plain (they said) that the Queen of England sought their ruin; for were Mary once free, it would be absurd to talk of the prosecution of the murder, or, indeed, of any other condition.

Touching their intended policy to France, a subject upon which Elizabeth was exceedingly jealous, Throckmorton found them resolved to hold, for the present, the same cautious course which they pursued to England, neither positively refusing nor accepting the overtures of the French king. These, indeed, as Lethington reported them to the English ambassador, were of an extraordinary description; and if Mary owed little gratitude to Elizabeth, she was certainly still less obliged to her royal relatives at that court, whose exertions at this moment were strenuously devoted to the setting up a party in Scotland composed of her enemies, the confederate lords. In accomplishing this, they were ready to sacrifice the captive queen. It was suggested that the government and the young prince should be managed by a council of the lords, acting, of course, under French influence; and as for the queen herself, De Croc, the ambassador, proposed to rid them of her altogether, and shut her up in a French convent.[1]

It is probable that the Scottish secretary had not exaggerated these intentions of France, for we find that at this very time the greatest offers were made by the French king to secure the services of the Earl of Moray, then at his court.[2] These splendid bribes he steadily rejected; but on the other hand, he was so far from embracing the interests of Morton and his associates, that he despatched one of his servants, Nicholas Elphinston, on a mission to the Scottish queen, assuring her of his devotion to her service.

Elphinston arrived in London a few days after Throckmorton's departure for Scotland. He was there admitted to a secret interview with Elizabeth, which lasted for an hour, and his communication had the effect of rendering her more favourable to Mary, and more hostile to the confederate lords. There is a curious piece of secret history connected with the interview between this envoy of Moray and Elizabeth, which is to be found in a letter of Mr Heneage, a gentleman of the court, to Cecil. This person was in waiting in the antechamber of the palace, when Elizabeth, after dismissing Moray's messenger, called him hastily and sent him to Cecil. He was directed by her to inform the prime minister that Moray had despatched his servant with letters to the Queen of Scotland, expressive of his attachment, and offering his service; that they were to be delivered to her own hands, and not to be seen by the confederates; and that he had in charge also to remonstrate with them for their audacity in imprisoning their sovereign. But this was not all: the rest of the commission given by the English queen to Heneage, is still more interesting in furnishing us with an admission, from her own lips, of that insidious dealing which so often marked her policy. Tell Cecil, said she, that he must instantly write a letter, in my name, to my sister, to which I will set my hand, for I cannot write it myself, as I have not "used her well and faithfully in these broken matters that be past. The purport of it must be, to let her know that the Earl of Moray never spoke defamedly of her for the death of her husband; never plotted for the secret conveying

[1] Robertson's Appendix, No. xxii., Throckmorton to Cecil, Fastcastle, 12th July 1567.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Norris to Elizabeth, Poissy, 2d July 1567. Same to Cecil, MS. Letter, Poissy, 2d July 1567. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Norris to Cecil Paris, 16th July 1567. ". . . Great is the travel and pain that hath been here taken to win the Earl of Moray, offering both the Order, and great augmentation of living; which, as he hath sent me word, he hath refused, lest, by taking gifts, he should be bound where he is now free."

of the prince to England; never confederated with the lords to depose her: on the contrary, now in my sister's misery let her learn from me the truth, and that is, that she has not a more faithful and honourable servant in Scotland."[1] At this date, therefore, (July 8,) if we are to believe this evidence, and there seems no good reason to question it, Moray was no party to the schemes of the confederates. On the contrary, he had declared himself against them, and was resolved to support and defend the queen his sovereign.

But to return to Throckmorton. This ambassador proceeded from Fastcastle to the capital, accompanied by Lord Hume and an escort of four hundred horse. The day after his arrival (July 13) there was a solemn fast held by the Reformed Church, the leaders of which were decided enemies of the Scottish queen; and his first impressions gave him little hope, either that he would be permitted to visit the royal captive, or be able to do her much good.[2] Nor did the confederate lords seem in any haste to have a conference with him; and when he accidentally met their leader Morton, he excused himself from entering upon business, as the day was devoted to sacred exercises. Lethington, however, came to him in the evening, and from the tone of his conversation, it was apparent to the ambassador that they were determined he should not be allowed to see Mary. They had already, he said, refused the French ambassador, and in the present state of things, they did not choose to irritate France.

As to the probable fate of the unhappy prisoner, Throckmorton found all things looking gloomily. Her chief supporters, the party of the Hamiltons, were divided in their councils, and almost equally treacherous in their intentions with her more open enemies. Being next heirs to the crown, it was generally believed that they would have been glad to have got rid both of Mary and the prince; and if we may credit Throckmorton, they only "made a show of the liberty of the queen, that they might induce these lords to destroy her, rather than they should recover her by violence out of their hands."[3] Argyle was tampering with the Lords of the Secret Council. Herries, though more attached to her service, was not to be trusted when his own interests came in the way; the French king and the queen-mother were ready to desert her, if they could gain the confederates; and, singular as the fact may appear to those who have given credit to the attacks of his opponents, her only true friend, at this moment, was the Earl of Moray. He had despatched Elphinston, as we have seen, to visit Mary and assure her of his services, and this envoy arrived in the capital much about the same time with Throckmorton. But when he requested to have access to the queen, and deliver his letters, he received a peremptory denial. It has been often asserted, and very commonly believed, that from the first rising of the lords against Mary and Bothwell, Moray was one of their party, in active correspondence with them; yet how are we to reconcile this with his present attachment to Mary's interests, his rejection of the offers of France, and the jealousy with which she was regarded by the confederates. But of all the enemies of the miserable queen, the most bitter were the Presbyterian clergy and the people. In the midst of their austerity and devotional exercises, the ministers expressed themselves with deep indignation against her, and looked forward with anxious interest to their great ecclesiastical council, which was to be held in eight days, and in which they had determined that the whole matter connected with the murder and her imprisonment should be debated.

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Mr T. Heneage to Cecil, from the court, 8th July 1567.

[2] Throckmorton to the Queen, Edinburgh, 14th July 1567, Robertson, Appendix, No. xxii.

[3] Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 18th July 1567. Also same to same, July 14, 1567. Both letters in Robertson's Appendix, No. xxii. And same to same, June 19, 1567, Caligula, C. i. fol. 18.

The more that Throckmorton investigated the state of parties during this interval, the more he became convinced of the hopelessness of his own interference, and the imminent peril of Mary. So far were the people from listening with any patience to the doctrines of passive obedience, which Elizabeth had instructed him to inculcate, that they took their stand on the very opposite ground—the responsibility of the prince, and the power of the nation to call their sovereign to account for any crimes she might have committed. "It is a public speech among all the people," (so wrote the ambassador to Elizabeth,) "that their queen hath no more liberty nor privilege to commit murder nor adultery than any other private person, neither by God's laws nor by the laws of the realm."[1] These popular principles were now for the first time openly and powerfully preached to the commons. Knox, Craig, and the other ministers of the Reformed Church, considered the pulpit and the press as the lawful vehicles of their political as well as their religious opinions; and the celebrated Buchanan, who had joined the confederates, enforced the same doctrines with uncommon vigour and ability. Their arguments were grounded on the examples of wicked princes in the Old Testament who were deposed and put to death for their idolatry, and on alleged but disputable precedents in their own history of similar severity exercised by subjects against their sovereigns.[2] In consequence of all these efforts, the few friends who had at first ventured to defend the Scottish queen were silenced and intimidated, and the public mind became inflamed to such a state of madness and fury, that she began to think of saving her life by retiring to a nunnery in France, or living with the old Duchess of Guise.[3]

[1] Throckmorton to Elizabeth, July 18, 1567, Robertson, Appendix, No. xxii.

[2] Ibid.

[3] State-paper Office, Throckmorton to the Queen, July 16, 1567. Printed by Laing, vol. ii. p. 122.

At this moment Robert Melvil was for the third time sent by the confederates to Lochleven, instructed to make a last effort to prevail upon his mistress to renounce Bothwell. By him Throckmorton found an opportunity to convey a letter, in which he strongly urged Mary to the same course.[4] But the mission was completely unsuccessful: the queen, who believed herself to be with child, declared her firm resolution rather to die than desert her husband, and declare her child illegitimate. She requested Melvil, at the same time, to deliver a letter to the lords, which implored them to have consideration of her health, and to change the place of her imprisonment to Stirling, where she might have the comfort of seeing her son. She was willing, she said, to commit the government of the realm, either to the Earl of Moray alone, or to a council of the nobility; and proposed that, if they would not obey her as their queen, they should regard her with some favour as the mother of their prince, and the daughter of their king. To this interview between Mary and Melvil no one was admitted, and before he took his leave she produced a letter, requesting him to convey it to Bothwell. This he peremptorily refused, upon which she threw it angrily into the fire.[5]

On his return to the capital, he found the animosity against the queen at its height, and the English ambassador in despair of being able to restrain it from some fatal excess. Many openly declared that no power, either within or without the realm, should preserve her from that signal punishment which her notorious crimes deserved. Others, more moderate, proposed to restore her to the royal dignity, if she consented to divorce Bothwell; some advised that she should resign in favour of the prince, who might govern by a council, whilst she retired for life to France. This was Athole's scheme, and not disliked by

[4] Robert Melvil's Declaration, Hopetoun MSS., Throckmorton to the Queen, July 18, 1567, Robertson, Appendix, No. xxii.

[5] Melvil's Declaration, Hopetoun MSS.

Morton; but to the majority of the privy-council it was unacceptable. They deemed it indispensable that Mary should be publicly arraigned and condemned to perpetual imprisonment as guilty of the king's murder, whilst some went so far as to insist that she should not only be condemned and degraded, but put to death.[1]

When such was the state of public feeling, the General Assembly of the Church convened in Edinburgh.[2] The Protestant clergy had already entered into a strict coalition with Morton and the Lords of the Secret Council, who now held the whole power of the government; and the proceedings of their ecclesiastical tribunal partook of the rigorous and uncompromising character of Knox and Buchanan, its leaders. It was argued that the queen was guilty of crimes for which she ought to forfeit her life, and there seemed to be every probability that this dreadful result was about to take place, had it not been for the interference of Throckmorton, who, with the utmost earnestness, remonstrated against such an extremity.[3] After violent debates, a more moderate course was adopted. Mary had (as we have seen) already intimated her readiness to resign the government to the Earl of Moray. It was now resolved to follow up the idea; and for this purpose Lord Lindsay, who had left Lochleven to attend the General Assembly, was despatched thither in company with Robert Melvil. From this nobleman, one of the fiercest zealots of his party, Mary had everything to dread: her passionate menace to him on the day she was taken prisoner at Carberry[4] had not been forgotten, and he was now selected as a man whom she would hardly dare to resist. He carried with him three instruments drawn up by the lords in their sovereign's name. By the first she was made to demit the government of the realm in favour of her son, and to give orders for his immediate coronation; by the second, she, in consequence of his tender infancy, constituted her "dear brother," the Earl of Moray, regent of the realm; and by the third, she appointed the duke, with the Earls of Lennox, Argyle, Athole, Morton, Glencairn, and Mar, regents of the kingdom till the return of Moray from France, with power to continue in that high office, if he refused it.[5]

Before Lindsay was admitted, Melvil had a private interview with the queen, and assured her that her refusal to sign the papers would endanger her life. Nor was this going too far. It is certain that, had she proved obstinate, the lords were resolved to bring her to a public trial; that they spoke with the utmost confidence of her conviction for the king's murder, and affirmed that they possessed proof of her guilt in her own handwriting.[6] These threats and assertions were in all probability communicated to his royal mistress by Melvil; and he insinuated that she ought to be the less scrupulous, as any deed signed in captivity, and under fear of her life, was invalid. He brought a message to the same purpose from Athole and Lethington, and a letter from Throckmorton.

It was a trying moment for Mary; and for a short time she resisted every entreaty, declaring passionately that she would sooner renounce her life than her crown; but when Lindsay was admitted, his stern demeanour at once terrified her into compliance. He laid the instruments before her; and with eyes filled with tears, and a trembling hand, she took the pen and signed the papers without even reading their contents.[7] It was necessary, however, that they should pass the privy-seal; and here a new outrage was committed. The keeper, Thomas Sinclair, remonstrated, and declared that the queen being in ward, her resignation was ineffectual; Lindsay at-

[1] Caligula, C. i. fol. 18, MS. Letter, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, July 19, 1567.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Robert Melvil to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, July 29, 1567.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Supra, p. 257.

[5] Anderson, vol. ii. pp. 208–220, inclusive.

[6] MS. Letter, Throckmorton to Cecil, 25th July 1567. Caligula, C. i. fol. 22.

[7] Spottiswood, p. 211.

tacked his house, tore the seal from his hands, and compelled him by threats and violence to affix it to the resignation.[1]

Having been so far successful, the lords hurried on the consummation of their plans, and resolved without delay to crown the prince, requesting Throckmorton's presence at the ceremony, and despatching Sir James Melvil to invite the Hamiltons. The English ambassador, however, gave a peremptory refusal. Their whole proceedings, he said, had been contrary to the advice, and in contempt of the remonstrances of his mistress.[2] The Hamiltons also declined; not, as they commissioned Melvil to inform the confederate lords, on the ground of their being enemies,—so far from this they thanked them for their gentle message,—but simply because, from the first, they had been made no party to their intentions. It was their wish also, they said, to present a protest, that this coronation should not be prejudicial to the title of the Duke of Chastelherault as next heir to the crown; and their request having been granted, they professed to offer no opposition.[3]

It was determined that the coronation should be held in the High Church at Stirling, and thither the confederate lords repaired; but on their arrival a collision took place between the new and old opinions. The clergy, of whom Knox was the great leader, insisted that the king should not be anointed, but simply crowned, anointing being a Jewish rite, and abrogated by the gospel dispensation. Against this notion it was argued that the custom was not a superstitious relic, but an ancient solemnity recognised by the general usage of Christendom; and after a bitter contest, the objection was overruled, and the ceremonial proceeded, every endeavour having been made on the part of the lords to make it as solemn and magnificent as possible. In the procession Athole bore the crown, Morton the sceptre, and Glencairn the sword, whilst Mar, his governor, carried the infant prince in his arms into the church. The deeds of resignation by the queen were read; and Lindsay amd Ruthven did not scruple to attest upon oath that which they knew to be false, that Mary's demission was her own free act. Knox then preached the sermon; the crown was placed on the king's head by the Bishop of Orkney; Morton, laying his hand on the Gospels, took the oaths on behalf of his sovereign, that he should maintain the reformed religion and extirpate heresy; the lords swore allegiance, placing their hands on his head; the burgesses followed; and, in conclusion, the Earl of Mar lifted the monarch from the throne and carried him back to his nursery in the castle.[4] At night, in the capital, the blaze of bonfires, and universal mirth and dancing, attested the joy of the people.[5]

A more extraordinary revolution was perhaps never completed without bloodshed, and apparently with such disproportionate means. A small section of the nobles and the gentry, unsupported by foreign aid, with a handful of soldiers,[6] at no time exceeding four hundred men, opposed by the highest of the aristocracy, and threatened with the hostility of England and France, were seen to rise with appalling suddenness and strength: they dispel their enemies; they imprison their sovereign; they hesitate whether she shall not be openly arraigned and executed; they compel her to resign her regal authority; and they now, finally, place the crown on the head of her son, an infant of a year old, and possess themselves of the

1 We owe the discovery of this fact to Mr Riddell, in a paper published in *Blackwood's Magazine* for October 1817.

2 Throckmorton to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 26th July 1567. Stevenson's Selections, illustrating the reign of Mary, Queen of Scotland, p. 251. The Original is in the State-paper Office.

3 Throckmorton to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 31st July 1567. Stevenson's Selections, p. 253.

4 Throckmorton to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 31st July 1567, Stevenson, p. 257. Calderwood, MS. Hist., p. 684, Ayscough, 4735.

5 Throckmorton to Elizabeth, July 31, 1567.

6 By "soldiers," is here meant regular *waged* troops.

whole power of the government. If we look for the cause of this extraordinary success, it is to be traced chiefly, if not altogether, to the unhappy infatuation and imprudence of the queen. It was this that separated her friends, strengthened the hands of her enemies, gave ample field for the worst suspicions, and alienated from her the hearts and sympathy of the people. But to return.

The first intelligence of these events was received with the utmost indignation by Elizabeth. She had already instructed Throckmorton to remonstrate with the lords; she had warned him to beware of giving his presence or countenance to the coronation: she now interdicted him from holding any farther intercourse, as her ambassador, with men who had treated her with such discourtesy and contempt, and declared "that she would make herself a party against them to the revenge of their sovereign, and an example to all posterity."[1]

When her letters were delivered, the principal leaders, Morton, Mar, Glencairn, Hume, and Lethington, had come to Edinburgh, to await the arrival of Moray, to whom they had despatched an envoy, informing him of his having been chosen regent. Throckmorton, in obedience to his mistress's commands, kept aloof; but Tullibardine, the comptroller, and brother-in-law to the Earl of Mar, one of the *interim* regents, volunteered a visit; and, in the course of conversation on the late events, unveiled a scene of treachery upon the part of the Hamiltons, who had hitherto supported the queen, which filled him with horror. The two great leaders of this party were the Archbishop of St Andrews and the Abbot of Kilwinning; and when the English ambassador remonstrated upon the violence of the recent proceedings, and threatened the Lords of the Secret Council with hostility upon the part of Elizabeth, he was solemnly assured that a perseverance in such a course was the certain way to shorten Mary's life. "Within the last forty-eight hours," said the comptroller, "the Archbishop of St Andrews, on the part of the Hamiltons, has proposed to us to put the queen to death. They have recommended this course as the only certain method of reconciling all parties; and on our consenting to adopt it, they are ready to join us to a man, and to bring Argyle and Huntly along with them."

Throckmorton at first expressed his utter disbelief that any men, who had hitherto borne a fair character, could be guilty of such atrocious and cold-blooded treachery. He argued also on the point of expediency, that more profit might be made of the queen's life than of her death. She might be divorced from Bothwell and afterwards marry a son of the Duke's, or a brother of Argyle's. To this Tullibardine's answer was remarkable. "My lord ambassador," said he, "these matters you speak of have been in question amongst them, but now they see not so good an *outgait*[2] by any of those devices as by the queen's death. For she being taken away, they account but the little king betwixt them and home,[3] who may die. They love not the queen, and they know she hath no great fancy to any of them; and they fear her the more, because she is young and may have many children, which is the thing they would be rid of."[4] Throckmorton, however, persevered in his incredulity, and that same evening the Secretary Lethington held a secret conference with him, in which he assured him that Tullibardine had stated nothing but the truth. I think it right, as these are new facts in this part of our history, involving a charge of unwonted perfidy even in this age, to give the particulars of this extraordinary conversation in the words of the ambassador to Elizabeth. "The same day," said he, (he is describing the

[1] Orig. Draft, State-paper Office, Instructions to Sir N. Throckmorton, 27th July 1567. It is corrected in Cecil's hand.

[2] Outgait—outlet.

[3] The Hamiltons were nearest heirs to the crown, failing Mary and her son. Home here means the succession to the throne.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 9th August 1567.

events of the 7th of August,) "the Lord of Lethington came to visit me on behalf of all the lords. He demanded of me when I heard from your majesty, and what was the matter why I had sent to Stirling for audience. . . . I answered, to let the lords and him understand what your majesty did think of their rash proceedings, finding the matter very strange in this hasty sort to proceed with a queen, their sovereign, being a prince anointed, not having imparted their intent to your majesty. . . .

"For answer, the Laird of Lethington said, 'My Lord Ambassador, these lords did think their cause could suffer no delays; and as for imparting their purposes to the queen's majesty your sovereign, they doubted that neither she would allow that which was meet for them to do, neither could take any of their doings in good part. And where you have charged us with deprivation of the queen from her royal estate, it doth appear by such instruments as I sent you from Stirling, that we have not denuded the queen of her regality, but she hath voluntarily relinquished the same to her son.' I asked him," continued Throckmorton, "what freewill there might be, or uncompulsory consent, for a prisoner, and such a one as every day looked for to lose her life? 'Yea,' said he, 'it is you that seek to bring it to pass, what show soever the queen your mistress, or you, do make to save her life, or set her at liberty. For the Hamiltons and you concur together; you have nothing in your mouths but liberty, and nothing less in your hearts. My Lord Ambassador,' (he continued,) 'I have heard what you have said unto me; I assure you, if you should use this speech unto them, which you do unto me, all the world could not save the queen's life three days to an end; and as the case now standeth, it will be much ado to save her life.'

"I said, 'My Lord of Lethington, if you remember, I told you, at my first coming hither, when I understood you minded the coronation of her son, that when you had touched her dignity, you would touch her life shortly after.' . . . 'Well, my lord,' said he, 'I trust you do not take me to be one that doth thirst my sovereign's blood, or that would stain my conscience with the shedding of the same? You know how I have proceeded with you since your coming hither. I have given you the best advice I could to prevent extremity; and either the queen your sovereign will not be advised, or you do forbear to advise her. I say unto you, as I am a Christian man, if we which have dealt in this action would consent to take the queen's life from her, all the lords which hold out and lie aloof from us, would come and conjoin with us within these two days. This morning the Bishop of St Andrews and the Abbot of Kilwinning have sent a gentleman unto us for that purpose. And likewise the Earl of Huntly hath sent Duncan Forbes, within this hour, to conclude with us upon the same ground: and, to be plain with you, there be very few amongst ourselves which be of any other opinion.'"

Throckmorton then began to use persuasions to dissuade them from such a fearful extremity. Upon which Lethington assured him that, as far as he himself was concerned, there needed no argument—but he added, emphatically, "'How can you satisfy men that the queen shall not become a dangerous party against them in case she live and come to liberty?' I said, 'Divorce her from Bothwell.' He said, 'We cannot bring it to pass; she will in nowise hear of the matter.'" The conversation was then broken off by Sir James Balfour coming in to carry Lethington to the council, who were waiting for him.[1]

It is clear, then, that at this moment the Hamiltons, instead of being friends to the unhappy queen, as they are represented in our popular historians, were acting towards her with treachery and cruelty; they were ready to sacrifice her to their own dreams of ambition,[2] and the life of

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, 9th August 1567.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Throckmorton to Leicester, Edinburgh, 9th August 1567.

Mary was in the most imminent peril.[1] The remonstrances and arguments of Throckmorton, however, so far prevailed, that it was agreed the fatal blow should be suspended till the arrival of the Earl of Moray.

To this remarkable man, on whose movements so much depended, all eyes were now turned, and his future conduct became the subject of much discussion. He had been elected regent. Would he accept this high office, which, considering the divided state of parties, brought with it so many difficulties? What were his sentiments as to the extraordinary events which had lately taken place? The deposition and captivity of his sovereign, the coronation of the prince, the remonstrances of England, the efforts of France, above all, the guilt and punishment of the queen, now so strongly urged by that party of the Reformed Church with whom he had hitherto acted? All this was field for fearful conjecture to some—for anxious speculation to all; and Moray's was a character not easily fathomed, which often concealed purposes of great weight and determination under a blunt and open manner. He had now been absent from Scotland for nearly four months, and it is certain that, when Morton and the Lords of the Secret Council first planned that revolution, (14th May,) which ended so fatally to Mary, they had secretly communicated with him. The exact nature of that communication we know not, but it was reported that he approved of their designs; and a month later, after the imprisonment of the queen, they again entered into correspondence with him; once more, about a fortnight later; and once again, after the resignation of the queen, this correspondence was renewed. These facts are undoubtedly calculated to excite suspicion; and we are not to be surprised if, in the heat of the controversy which has agitated this portion of our history, it has been argued from them that Moray not only approved of, but directed all the plans of the conspirators. But the inquirer after truth dares not advance so rapidly. All that is proved amounts to the fact, that the lords of the confederacy against Mary, from the first, were anxious to gain him. Indeed, his election to the regency shewed how far they were ready to go to secure him: but of his answers to their letters we know nothing. It is also worthy of remark, that on the only occasion when we can detect a message sent to them by Moray, it was hostile to his reputed friends. Elphinston, whom we have seen deputed by him to communicate with his imprisoned mistress and her captors, brought an assurance of such comfort and loyalty to Mary, and so severe a remonstrance to the lords, that they interdicted him from seeing the queen until they had made up their minds to depose her or to put her to death. Such a message could not have proceeded from associates.

On being informed of his election to the regency, Moray prepared to leave France, and his intentions at this moment formed an object of the deepest interest to the court of England and the Tuileries. Elizabeth was naturally anxious to preserve the influence she had hitherto exerted in the affairs of Scotland. She considered her hold over the measures of that country as an essential part of the great system for the support of Protestantism in Europe. At the same time, however, she was highly incensed at the Lords of the Secret Council for their deposition of their sovereign: their conduct, in her opinion, was insulting to the majesty of the crown, and destructive of all principles of good government; and as she had determined to exert herself to procure the liberty of the captive queen, she was anxious to secure Moray in the same service. Such were the feelings of Elizabeth.

[1] Keith, p. 436, has fallen into the error of representing the band or agreement of the party of the Hamiltons at Dumbarton, as having been entered into about the 29th July, instead of the 29th June, which is its true date, as seen on the original instrument in the State-paper Office. In Mr Dawson Turner's volume of MS. Scottish letters, there is a copy of the same deed, with the correct date, 29th June.

The court of France, on the other hand, was equally anxious to preserve, or rather to recover, the influence it once held over Scotland; and at first the king declared that he would strain every effort to have Mary and the prince brought into his kingdom: but this idea was soon abandoned. The Scottish queen had never been a favourite with Catherine of Medicis; and provided they gained the confederate lords, in whose hands at this moment was the whole power of the government, and enlisted Moray in their interest, the French soon came to care little whether the queen remained a captive or was set at liberty. High bribes were offered him before his departure, and when he resisted these entreaties, and it began to be rumoured that he leant to the side of England, every impediment was thrown in the way of his return.[1] But such difficulties were overcome by his prudence and firmness. Without binding himself to France in any specific agreement, he assured the king of his desire to use every exertion for the deliverance of his sovereign; and left the court with Monsieur de Lignerolles, who was ordered to accompany him. Of this person the avowed object was to carry a message from the French king to the Lords of the Secret Council; but his real errand was to watch the proceedings of the regent-elect, and hurry him on to Scotland, without giving him time to communicate with Elizabeth.[2]

At this moment, when on the eve of leaving France, Moray was informed, probably by Elphinston, his own servant, of the alleged proofs of Mary's guilt, which had been discovered by her enemies in Scotland; his informant stating that he had seen and read a letter of the Scottish queen to Bothwell, which proved that she was privy to her husband's murder.[3] Hitherto the accusations against his sovereign had been vague and unsupported by proof; but if this were true, and if she still obstinately refused to renounce Bothwell, it appeared clear to him that her immediate restoration to liberty was impossible. At the same time, this intelligence necessarily worked a change in Moray's feelings more favourable to the confederate lords, and more severe towards his sovereign; so that, on his arrival at the English court, his interview with the queen was angry and unsatisfactory: Elizabeth expressed herself determined to restore the imprisoned queen, and to punish the audacious subjects who had dethroned her. Against this dictatorial tone, Moray's spirit rose, and the queen, who expected implicit obedience, upbraided him with such severity, that she shook his affection towards England, a result much deplored by Bedford and Throckmorton. These able persons, and her chief minister Cecil, who were intimately acquainted with the state of the two parties, had earnestly enforced on the queen the necessity of leaving Mary to her fate, and encouraging the lords who had deposed her: they considered her cause to be desperate; and they believed such a course to be the only likely way to prevent these men from throwing themselves into the arms of the French king, who had made them flattering advances, and was ready to desert the Scottish queen. It was to the honour of Elizabeth that she repudiated this advice, refused to abandon the cause of the captive princess, and perceiving the change in Moray's mind, dismissed him with no kindly feeling.[4]

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Norris to Cecil, Poissy, 2d July 1567, French Correspondence. MS. Letter, original, State-paper Office, Norris to Cecil, July 16, 1567, French Correspondence. Also Norris to Elizabeth, July 23, 1567. Stevenson's Selections, p. 243.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Norris to Cecil, Paris, July 16, 1567.

[3] Gonzalez Apuntamientos, p. 323. From a letter of Norris to Cecil, MS. State-paper Office, 23d July 1567, French Correspondence, it appears that Moray left the French court at that time. Also Throckmorton to Cecil, August 2, 1567. Stevenson's Selections, p. 263.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Bedford to Cecil, 10th August 1567. Also

On the 8th of August he reached Berwick, accompanied by De Lignerolles. Here he was the guest of Bedford, his ancient friend and associate; and was met by two envoys from the lords of the confederacy, Sir James Makgill, lord clerk-register, and the well-known Sir James Melvil: the first was the representative of that section who were most determined against the queen; the other was deputed by that more moderate class who wished to spare her life, and contemplated the possibility of her restitution. Both of these were fully able to inform him of the state of parties; and Makgill, who had been a principal actor in the deposition of his sovereign, and knew all that could be urged against her, explained to him their whole proceedings, and urged the absolute necessity of his accepting the regency. Moray, however, refused to commit himself; and, pursuing his journey, was met at the Bound Rode, the line which separates the two countries, by a troop of four hundred noblemen and gentlemen who had assembled to honour his arrival. From thence he rode to Whittingham.

It was only a year and a half before, that in this fatal house the conference had been held between Lethington, Bothwell, and Morton, in which the king's murder was determined. Bothwell was now a fugitive and an outlaw; but his associates in guilt, the same Lethington and Morton, now received Moray at Whittingham, and cordially sympathised with him, when he expressed his horror for the crime, and his resolution to avenge it.

After a night's rest, the regent-elect proceeded to the capital, which he entered next day, surrounded by the nobility, and amid the acclamations of the citizens. Here for two days he employed himself unremittingly in examining the state of the two factions, holding consultations with his friends, and acquiring the best information as to the difficulties he might have to encounter in accepting the high office which was offered him. He had already held an interview with Throckmorton, the English ambassador, who met him for this purpose a few miles from Edinburgh; and to this able judge, who had no interest to blind him, Moray appeared to be acting with sincerity and honour. He was already aware of the general nature of De Lignerolles' message to the lords of the confederacy; and in the secret consultations which he held with these persons, the whole history of their proceedings must have been laid before him. From them he now learnt the full extent of Mary's infatuation and alleged guilt; the proofs and letters which, as they asserted, convicted her of participation in her husband's murder, were now, no doubt, imparted to him; and he was made aware of the stern determination which many of them had embraced, of bringing her to a public trial, and, if convicted, putting her to death. As to the difficulties of his situation, the faction of the Hamiltons and the hostility of Elizabeth were the principal obstacles in his way; but the first were divided in their counsels, and the English queen would soon, he trusted, be induced by Cecil to remove her opposition. On the whole, he felt almost resolved to accept the regency, but one point made him still hesitate. The demission of the crown, the deeds which nominated himself, and sanctioned the coronation of the prince, were said to have been extorted from Mary. If true, this would vitiate his title to the office, and he requested permission to see the queen in Lochleven before he gave his final answer. This demand startled the lords, and some thought it would be injudicious to grant it. To Throckmorton, the English ambassador, he had expressed himself with great commiseration towards the captive princess, and they dreaded the consequences of his pity or sympathy.

At last, however, they consented; and, on the 15th of August, Moray, in company with Morton, Athole, and Lord Lindsay, visited the queen in her prison. It was a remarkable and

13th August 1567, B.C., Bedford to Cecil. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., 1st August 1567, Bedford to Cecil.

affecting interview. Mary received them with tears, and passionately complained of her wrongs. Then taking Moray aside, before supper, she eagerly questioned him as to the intentions of the lords, and in vain endeavoured to fathom his own. Contrary to his usual open and frank demeanour, he was gloomy, silent, and reserved. When the bitter meal had past, she again spoke to him in private; and, torn by fear and suspense, pathetically described her sufferings. He was her brother, she said, her only friend, he must know her fate, for he was all-powerful with her enemies; would he now withhold his counsel and assistance in this extremity of her sorrow? What was she to look for? She knew some thirsted for her blood. In the end, she implored him to keep her no longer in doubt, but to speak out; and, even were it to criminate her, to use all freedom and plainness.[1]

Thus urged, Moray, without mitigation or disguise, laid before her the whole history of her misgovernment; using a severity of language, and earnestness of rebuke, more suited (to use a phrase of Throckmorton's) to a ghostly confessor than a counsellor: her ill-advised marriage with Darnley, her hasty love, her sudden estrangement, the dark scene of his murder, the manifest guilt of Bothwell, his pretended trial, his unjust acquittal, her infatuated passion, her shameless marriage, her obstinate adherence to the murderer, the hatred of her subjects, her capture, her imprisonment, the allegations of the lords that they could convict her by her own letters of being accessory to the murder, their determination to bring her to a public trial, and to put her to an ignominious death; all these points were insisted on, with a severity and plainness to which the queen had seldom been accustomed, and the dreadful picture plunged the unhappy sufferer into an agony of despair. Throughout the dismal recital, she interrupted him by extenuations, apologies, confessions, and sometimes by denials. The conversation had been prolonged till past midnight; and Mary, weeping and clinging to the hope of life, again and again implored her brother's protection: but Moray was unmoved, or, at least, he judged it best to seem so, and retired to his chamber, bidding her seek her chief refuge in the mercy of God.[2]

Next morning, at an early hour, she sent for him, and perceiving the impression he had made, he assumed a milder mood, threw in some words of consolation, and assured her that, whatever might be the conduct of others, to save her life he was ready to sacrifice his own; but, unfortunately, the decision lay not with him alone, but with the lords, the Church, and the people. Much also depended on herself; if she attempted an escape, intrigued to bring in the French or the English, and thus disturbed the quiet government of her son, or continued in her inordinate affection to Bothwell, she need not expect to live; if she deplored her past sins, shewed an abhorrence for the murder of her husband, and repented her former life with Bothwell, then might he hold out great hope that those in whose power she now lay would spare her life. As to her liberty he said, in conclusion, that was at present out of the question. He had, as yet, only a single voice in the state, like other nobles; it was therefore not in his power to procure it, nor would it be for her interest at this moment to desire it. It was Mary's weakness (in the present case we can hardly call it such) to be hurried away by impulses. She had passed the night under the dreadful conviction that her fate was decided, that she had but a short time to live. She now discerned a gleam of hope, and, starting from her seat, took Moray in her arms, and urged him to accept the regency, as the best and safest course for herself, her son, and her kingdom. He declined it, she again pressed it on him; he gave his reasons against undertaking so arduous a task. She replied, and insisted, that the ser-

[1] Throckmorton to the Queen, August 20, 1567. Keith, p. 444.

[2] Throckmorton to the Queen, August 20, 1567. Keith, p. 444.

vice of his sovereign and his country ought to outweigh every selfish motive. He at last assented; the queen then suggested that his first efforts should be directed to get all the forts into his hands, and requested him to take her jewels and other articles of value, into his custody, as her only way of preserving them. On taking leave, she embraced and kissed him with tears, and sent by him her blessing to her son. Moray then turned to Lindsay, Ruthven, and Lochleven, and recommending them to treat their royal mistress with all gentleness, left the castle.[1]

Having thus effected his purpose, with much address and some little duplicity, Moray and his companions repaired to Stirling to visit the prince. Here they remained until the evening of the 19th of August, when they returned to the capital; and, on the 22d, he was solemnly declared regent. The ceremony of his inauguration was held in the council-chamber within the Tolbooth, where, in presence of the Lords of the Secret Council, the nobility, spirituality, and commissioners of burghs, the instruments granted by the queen were publicly read. After this, the earl delivered an oration, in which he alluded to his own unfitness for so high an office, accepted the charge, and took the oath with his hand upon the Gospels. He swore that, to the utmost of his power, he would serve God, according to His holy Word revealed in the New and Old Testament; that he would maintain the true religion as it was then received within that realm; that he would govern the people according to the ancient and lovable laws of the kingdom; procure peace, repress all wrong, maintain justice and equity, and root out from the realm all heretics and enemies to the true Church of God.[2] He was then proclaimed, amid universal acclamations, at the cross of Edinburgh, and throughout all the counties and burghs of the kingdom. Information of this event was instantly sent to the Earl of Bedford at Berwick, who next day communicated it to Cecil.[3]

CHAPTER IX.

REGENCY OF THE EARL OF MORAY.

1567—1569.

IMMEDIATELY after his acceptance of the government, Moray invited Throckmorton to a conference. He obeyed, and found the regent and Secretary Lethington sitting together, upon which he conveyed to them "in as earnest and vehement a form as he could set it forth," the queen his mistress's severe disapproval of their recent conduct. To this remonstrance Maitland made a bold reply. He renounced, for himself and his colleagues, all intention of harm to the person and honour of his royal mistress in their late proceedings. "So far from it," said he, "Mr Ambassador, that we wish her to be queen of all the world; but now she is in the state of a person in the delirium of a fever, who refuses

[1] Throckmorton to the Queen, August 20, 1567. British Museum, Caligula, C. i. folio xxviii. Printed by Keith, p. 444.

[2] Anderson's Collections, vol. ii. pp. 252, 253.

[3] Bedford to Cecil, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., August 23, 1567, Berwick. Also Throckmorton to Cecil, Aug. 23, 1567. Stevenson's Selections, p. 289.

everything which may do her good, and requires all that may work her harm. Be assured nothing will be more prejudicial to her interest, than for your mistress to precipitate matters. It may drive us to a strait, and compel us to measures we would gladly avoid. Hitherto have we been content to be charged with grievous and infamous titles; we have quietly suffered ourselves to be condemned as perjured rebels and unnatural traitors, rather than proceed to anything that might touch our sovereign's honour. But beware, we beseech you, that your mistress, by her continual threats and defamations, by hostility, or by soliciting other princes to attack us, do not push us beyond endurance. Think not we will lose our lives, forfeit our lands, and be challenged as rebels throughout the world, when we have the means to justify ourselves. And if there be no remedy but your mistress will have war, sorry though we be, far rather will we take our fortune, than put our queen to liberty in her present mood, resolved as she is to retain and defend Bothwell, to hazard the life of her son, to peril the realm, and to overthrow her nobility."[1]

"For your wars," he continued, "we know them well: you will burn our Borders, and we shall burn yours; if you invade us, we do not dread it, and are sure of France; for your practices to nourish dissension amongst us, we have an eye upon them all. The Hamiltons will take your money, laugh you to scorn, and side with us. At this moment we have the offer of an agreement with them in our hands. The queen, your mistress, declares she wishes not only for our sovereign's liberty, and her restoration to her dignity, but is equally zealous for the preservation of the king, the punishment of the murder, and the safety of the lords. To accomplish the first, our queen's liberty, much has been done; for the rest, absolutely nothing. Why does not her majesty fit out some ships of war to apprehend Bothwell, and pay a thousand soldiers to reduce the forts and protect the king? When this is in hand, we shall think her sincere; but for her charge to set our sovereign forthwith at liberty, and restore her to her dignity, it is enough to reply to such strange language, that we are the subjects of another prince, and know not the queen's majesty for our sovereign."[2]

As soon as Lethington had concluded, Throckmorton, turning to Moray, expressed a hope that such sentiments would at least not meet his approval. He was not "banded" with these lords, he had committed none of their excesses. But Moray was now secure: he had little to fear from Elizabeth, nothing from France, and his answer was as decided, though more laconic than the secretary's. "Truly, my lord Ambassador," said he, "methinks you have had reason at the Laird of Lethington's hands. It is true that I have not been at the past doings of these lords, yet I must commend what they have done; and seeing the queen my sovereign and they have laid on me the charge of the regency, a burden I would gladly have avoided, I am resolved to maintain their action, and will reduce all men to obedience in the king's name, or it shall cost me my life."[3]

The ambassador had been long aware that his further stay in Scotland would be totally useless. He had earnestly solicited his recall; and Elizabeth now agreed to it, but ordered him first to make a last remonstrance in favour of the captive queen, and to request to be admitted to her presence. This, as he had looked for, was peremptorily refused by Moray. They had excluded De Ligneroles, the French ambassador, he said, who had so lately left them; and it was impossible to admit him: for the rest of his message from the Queen of England, the regent, after his usual fashion, replied to it with great brevity: as to his acceptance of the government, the deed was

[1] Throckmorton to Elizabeth, August 22, 1567. Keith, p. 448.

[2] Throckmorton to Elizabeth, August 22, 1567, printed by Keith, p. 448, from original, Caligula, C. i. fol. xxxii.

[3] Ibid., ut supra.

done; for calumny he cared little, and would use none other defence than a good conscience and a sincere intention; to satisfy the queen that his mistress had consented, he could only say that he had her own word and signature; for her liberty, its being granted depended upon accidents; and as to her condition after Bothwell's apprehension, it would be idle, he said, to bargain for the bear's-skin before they had him. The ambassador, before he took his leave, was pressed to accept a present of plate in the name of the king. This was declined in strong terms, and on the 29th of August he left the capital for England.

Moray now addressed himself with characteristic decision and courage to the cares of government; and, to use Throckmorton's expressive phrase, "went stoutly to work, resolved rather to imitate those who had led the people of Israel than any captains of that age."[1] He instantly despatched the Laird of Grange and Murray of Tullibardine, with three armed ships, in pursuit of Bothwell, who, after lurking in the north, and in vain attempting to make a party in these remote districts, had fled to Orkney and turned pirate.[2] He next employed the most vigorous measures to compel the whole kingdom to acknowledge the king's government; to secure himself against attack if Elizabeth should meditate it, and to keep up pacific relations with France, which, from the tone all along assumed by De Lignerolles, he was assured would not be difficult. The Hamiltons had made some feeble attempts to prevent the regent being proclaimed within their bounds; but they acted with no fixed plan, had no leader of ability, and gave him little anxiety.[3]

A large proportion of the nobles who had hitherto been hostile or neutral now sent in their adherence to his government; and Sir James Balfour, the governor of the castle of Edinburgh, delivered that fortress into his hands. This infamous man was the intimate friend of Bothwell, and a principal actor in the king's murder. It might have been expected that Moray, who had lately expressed so much horror for that deed, and so determined a resolution to avenge it, would have been the last to overlook the crime in one of the principal conspirators; but, like other ambitious men, he could make his conscience give way to his interest, as the treaty in question completely proved. Its first stipulation was, that Balfour should have an ample remission as an accomplice in the murder; the next, that before he gave up the keys of the castle, five thousand pounds should be paid down; the last, that he himself should have the Priory of Pittenweem, and his son an annuity. All this was agreed to, apparently without difficulty, and only two days after his assuming the regency, Moray in person took possession of the castle.[4]

As if to cover the shame of this transaction, the regent made unusual exertions to seize some of the inferior delinquents. Previous to his arrival in Scotland, Captain Blacater had been taken and executed: he now apprehended John Hay of Tallo, a page of the king's called Durham, black John Spens, John Blacater, and James Edmonson.[5] The guilt of Tallo, as a principal agent in the murder, was completely proved, but his examination threw Moray into great perplexity, for, to use Bedford's words to Cecil, he not only "opened the whole device of the murder," but "declared who were the executioners of the same, and went so far as to touch a great many, not of the smallest."[6] We have already seen that Lethington, Morton,

1. Throckmorton to Cecil, August 20, 1567, in Stevenson's Selections, p. 282.

2 Throckmorton to Cecil, August 26, 1567, Stevenson's Selections, p. 294. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Bedford to Cecil, Berwick, September 11, 1567.

3 Throckmorton to the Queen, Aug. 23, 1567, Stevenson's Selections, p. 291.

4 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Throckmorton to Cecil, August 26, 1567. History of James the Sext, p. 18.

5 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Bedford to Cecil, September 5, 1567. And same to same, September 11, 1567.

6 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Bedford to Cecil, September 16, 1567.

and Argyle, three of the most powerful men in Scotland, were either accomplices in the assassination, or consenting to its perpetration; and there can be no doubt that they, amongst others, were implicated in Tallo's confession. But in what manner was Moray to proceed? It was these very men who had placed him in the regency; with them he now acted familiarly and confidentially: their cause could not with safety be separated from his own. He might indeed attempt to seize and punish them, but such was their strength, that it would be at the risk of being plucked down from his high office by the same hands which had built him up. The truth, however, probably was, that Moray had been long aware of the true character of the persons by whose successful guilt he now profited, and had determined to favour the higher culprits, whilst he let loose the vengeance of the law upon the lesser delinquents. He could not prevent the people, however, and all the more honest part of the nation, from arraigning such interested conduct; but he little heeded these murmurs; and for the present Hay's examination was suppressed, and his trial indefinitely postponed: Durham, the king's page, also was kept in prison in irons.[1]

The regent now summoned the castle of Dunbar, which was still held for Bothwell by one of his retainers. Its governor affected to resist, but Moray bombarded it in person, and in a few days the garrison capitulated. A last effort of the Hamiltons to get up a resistance was only made to be abandoned; Argyle, who had encouraged it, submitted, bringing with him Boyd, Livingston, and the Abbot of Kilwinning. This last person was deputed by the Archbishop of St Andrews, the leader of the Hamiltons, to make his peace; Huntly and Herries, much about the same time, gave in their adherence to the king's government; and the regent, on the 15th of September, informed his friend Cecil that the whole realm was quiet.[2]

In the midst of these transactions, Grange returned unsuccessful from his pursuit of Bothwell. He had boasted to Bedford that he would either bring back the murderer or lose his life in the attempt; but, in giving chase, Grange's ship, one of the largest in the Scottish navy, struck upon a sand-bank, and although he boarded and brought home with him one of Bothwell's vessels, the Earl himself, in a lighter craft, escaped to Norway. In one respect the expedition was important, as Hepburn of Bolton, an accomplice in the king's murder, was seized in the ship, and, by his confession, threw additional light on that dark transaction. For the present, however, his revelations were not suffered to be known.[3]

Moray now summoned a parliament, (December 15,) the proceedings of which evince the new regent's complete connexion and sympathy with the party of the Reformed Church, and demand especial attention. It has been asserted that it was thinly attended, but the remark can only apply to the bishops, who represented the ecclesiastical estate, of whom but four appeared, Moray, Galloway, Orkney, and Brechin. There were present, however, fourteen abbots, twelve earls, sixteen lords and masters, the name given to lords' eldest sons, and twenty-seven commissioners of burghs.[4] The discussions were opened in a speech by Lethington, of which a copy still remains in his own handwriting, and it were to be wished that its truth and sincerity had been equal to its talent. He alluded to the vast importance of the crisis in which they

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, September 17, 1567, Occurrents out of Scotland.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Bedford to Cecil, 16th September 1567. MS. Ibid., proceedings of the Hamiltons, 17th September 1567. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Moray to Cecil, 15th September 1567.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 11th September 1567, Moray to Cecil. Also Melvil's Memoirs, p. 186. Also 16th September, MS. Letter, B.C., Bedford to Cecil.

[4] Anderson, vol. ii. pp. 228-230. Also MS., State-paper Office, December 15, 1567.

met, and the subjects upon which they were about to legislate, any one of which would, he said, have been enough to have occupied a parliament. These were, the establishing a uniform religion; the acknowledgment of the just authority of the king in consequence of the queen's free demission of the crown in his favour; the sanction to be given to the appointment of a regent chosen to act in the king's minority; the reuniting the minds of the nobility; the punishment of the cruel murder of the late king, their sovereign's father; and many other disorders requiring the grave consideration of their lordships. Upon these heads, he said, he would not dilate, but two points he must not omit, both tending to their great comfort, and calling for deep gratitude. The first was, the success which, in matters of religion, had followed such comparatively small beginnings; the second, their happy fortune in having in the regent a nobleman so excellently qualified to carry their ordinances into execution, whether they related to the Church or the commonwealth. "As to religion," said he, "the quietness you presently enjoy, declares sufficiently the victory that God by His Word has obtained among you, within the space of eight or nine years; how feeble the foundation was in the eyes of men, how unlikely it was to rise so suddenly to so large and huge a greatness, with what calmness the work has proceeded, not one of you is ignorant. Iron has not been heard within the house of the Lord, that is to say, the whole has been builded, set up, and erected to this greatness, without bloodshed. Note it, I pray you, as a singular testimony of God's favour, and a peculiar benefit granted only to the realm of Scotland, not as the most worthy, but chosen out by His providence from among all nations, for causes hid and unknown to us, and to foreshew His almighty power, that the true religion has obtained a free course universally throughout the whole realm, and yet not a Scotchman's blood shed in the forthsetting of the whole quarrel. With what nation in the earth has God dealt so mercifully? Consider the progress of religion from time to time in other countries—Germany, Denmark, England, France, Flanders, or where you please: you shall find the lives of many thousands spent before they could purchase the tenth part of that liberty whereunto we have attained, as it were sleeping upon down beds."[1]

When we recollect the events of the few last years,—the rising of Moray against the queen's marriage, the murder of Riccio, the flight of Morton, the assassination of Darnley, the confederacy against Bothwell, and the imprisonment of the queen, all of them events more or less connected with the establishment of the Reformation in Scotland,—and remember also that Lethington was deeply engaged in them all, it is certainly difficult which most to condemn—the gross inaccuracy of this picture, or the hardihood evinced by its coming from his lips.

But to return to the proceedings of the parliament. The committee of the Lords of the Articles having been chosen,[2] the three estates sanctioned the queen's demission of the crown, the king's coronation, and the appointment of Moray to the regency. The Pope's authority was next abolished, the Act to that effect passed in the disputed parliament of 1560, being solemnly ratified. All laws repugnant to the Word of God were annulled; and the "Confession of Faith," which had been already read and approved of in a former parliament, was sanctioned and published. All heretics and hearers of mass were made liable to punishment, confiscation of movables being declared the penalty for the first offence, banishment for the

[1] MS. State-paper Office. An Oration of the Lord of Lethington, at the Parliament of Scotland, December 1567, in Lethington's own hand.

[2] It was composed of the Bishops of Moray, Galloway, and Orkney; the Abbots of Dunfermline, Melrose, Newbottle, Balmerino, St Colm's Inch, Pittenweem, and Portmoak; the Earls of Huntly, Argyle, Morton, Athole, Glencairn, Mar, and Caithness; the Lords Hume, Lindsay, and Sempil; with the Provosts of Edinburgh, Dundee, Montrose, Aberdeen, St Andrews, Cupar, Stirling, and Ayr.

second, and death for the third. Such persons as opposed the "Confession of Faith," or refused to receive the sacraments after the Presbyterian form, were declared to be no members of the Church of Christ. The examination and admission of ministers was declared a prerogative inherent in the Church, but to lay patrons was continued the power of presentation, with an appeal to the General Assembly, if their nomination of a qualified person was not sustained by the superintendents and ministers; and, lastly, all kings, at their coronation, or princes, or magistrates acting in their place, were bound to take the oath for the support of the true Church and the extirpation of heresy.[1]

So far everything succeeded to the wishes of the reformed clergy; but their endeavour to repossess themselves of the patrimony of the Church was not so fortunate. They pleaded a former promise to this effect, and, if we may credit Bishop Spottiswood, the regent shewed an anxiety to fulfil it; but the laymen, who had violently seized the property of the Church when it was in the hands of the Roman Catholic clergy, manifested the same violence now that their own ministers proposed to resume possession, and, with difficulty, consented to restore to them a third of the benefices.[2] It was next ordered that a reformation should be made in all schools, colleges, and universities, and that no teachers were to be admitted but such as had been examined and approved by the appointed visitors and superintendents; and lastly, that, as far as concerned the preaching of the Word, the reformation of manners, and the administration of the sacraments, no other ecclesiastical powers should be acknowledged than those which were now claimed by the Presbyterian Church, to which they gave the title of the Immaculate Spouse of Christ.[3]

A keen debate arose when the subject of the queen's imprisonment came before the Assembly, which was greatly divided in opinion. Many, who were convinced of their sovereign's guilt, and who had adopted the views lately promulgated by the ministers in their pulpit addresses, contended that she should be brought to a public trial, and, if the crime was proved, punished by the laws like any other subject of the realm. To this it was objected that the monarch was the source of all authority; that she could not, without absurdity and contradiction, be made amenable to an inferior jurisdiction, but was accountable for her conduct to God alone. It was replied, that extraordinary crimes required extraordinary remedies; but this doctrine was not generally acceptable. The discussion concluded in a resolution that the imprisonment of the queen should be continued, and an act of parliament passed for the exoneration of those noblemen and barons who had risen in arms for the prosecution of the murder. The terms of this act, which were nearly similar to a previous resolution of the Privy-council, require a moment's notice, as it is in it that we find the first public mention of those letters of Mary to Bothwell, which, it was afterwards contended, completely proved her guilt. It declared the conduct and transactions of these lords, from the 10th of February (the day of Darnley's murder) till the present time, to be lawful and loyal; that they should never be subjected to any prosecution for what they had done, because, if the queen were confined, it was solely in consequence of her own fault and demerit, seeing that, by several of her private letters, written wholly with her own hand, and sent by her to Bothwell, and by her ungodly and pretended marriage with him, it was most certain that she was cognisant, art and part, of the murder of the king her husband. This declaration of the estates having been signed and sealed, and ordered to be printed along with the other statutes, the parliament was dissolved.[4]

[1] Spottiswood, p. 214. Maitland, vol. ii. p. 1006. Black Acts, fol. 1-5. c. 1, 2.
[2] Maitland, vol. ii. p. 1007.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 62, 69. The words in the Black Acts. Anderson, vol. ii. p. 221,

It appears, by an act of Privy-council, dated the 16th September 1568, that the Earl of Morton had, at that time,[1] delivered to the regent the little box or coffer, with the letters and sonnets which it contained. It was to these letters that the act now quoted referred; and the partial and unjust conduct of Moray and the parliament need hardly be pointed out. Such documents might or might not be originals; but by every principle of justice the queen ought not to have been condemned, nor should these letters have been received as evidence of the justice of that condemnation, until she had enjoyed in person, or by her counsel, an opportunity of examining the proofs produced against her. This injustice, however, was little in comparison with another proceeding of Moray's, who, having now tasted the sweets of absolute power, and being determined at all hazard to retain it, became little scrupulous of the means which he employed. Sir James Balfour, as we have seen, had been the confidant of Bothwell, and was the depositary of the bond or contract which was drawn up for the murder of the king. It had been seen by one of the accomplices in the murder, named Ormiston, who affirmed that Bothwell pointed out certain signatures, which he declared to be those of Argyle, Huntly, Lethington, and Balfour himself.[2] This profligate adherent of Bothwell's kept the bond, along with the queen's jewels and other property of value, in the castle of Edinburgh, which fortress the Duke of Orkney had committed to his charge; but he betrayed the place, as we have seen, to Moray; and, on its delivery, the regent, now all-powerful, might have stipulated for the delivery of all the evidence which threw light upon so foul a plot. In estimating his moral character, which has been highly extolled by some writers, it is instructive to mark in what way he appears to have proceeded. The letters alleged to be written by the queen were preserved, exhibited to the council, and quoted to the parliament as proofs of her guilt. Her jewels and other apparel were delivered up by Balfour[3] to Moray, but the "bond" which connected his friends with the murder was appropriated by Lethington, committed to the flames, and destroyed for ever. We learn this important fact, which is new in the controversy, from a letter addressed by Drury to Cecil, on the 28th of November, a short time before the meeting of the parliament. "The writings," said he, "which did comprehend the names and consents of the chief for the murdering of the king is turned into ashes, the same not unknown to the queen; and the same that concerns her part kept to be shewn, which offends her." It is true there is here no assertion that the regent himself threw the bond into the fire, and it was Lethington's and Balfour's interest, as it criminated themselves, to have it destroyed; but that Moray consented to its destruction, whilst he preserved the evidence against the queen, the whole circumstances appear to me to demonstrate. Drury, in the same letter to Cecil, observed, "that Moray made fair weather with Mary, and was dealing very soundly and uprightly." Sir William's ideas as to upright conduct, unless the expression was used solely with reference to the safety assured by the regent to his own associates, must have been peculiar.

Of this partial dealing he now gave another signal instance in the trial of those delinquents who were in custody for the king's murder. Their names were Hay of Tallo, John Hepburn of Bolton, George Dalgleish, a page or chamberlain, and William Powrie, a servant of Bothwell's. It was well known at the time of his being appre-

are, "divers her privie letters written halelie [wholly] with her own hand." The words of the act of Privy-council are, "divers her privie letters, written and subscribed with her own hand."

1. Anderson, vol. ii. p. 257.
2. Supra, p. 64.
3. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Bedford to Cecil, Berwick, 5th September 1567. Ibid. same to same, 11th September 1567. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, October 15, 1570, and MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Cecil, November 28, 1567.

hended that Hay, the confidant of Bothwell, had not only given a full detail of the murder, but had accused some of the highest nobility of being accomplices in it.[1] It was equally notorious that Captain Cullen, who had been employed in his most secret concerns by the chief murderer, had revealed the whole circumstances,[2] and that the lords and the regent must have been in possession of his confession. So general was the expectation of these disclosures being made public, that Sir William Drury, in writing to Cecil upon the subject, informed him that Tallo's life had been spared for a little only, until some of the great persons who were acquanted with the cruel deed were apprehended. All therefore looked forward with intense anxiety to the trial of these men, and it was confidently demanded that, as so much pains had been taken in the recent parliament to criminate the queen, the same care should be employed to discover who else were guilty, that, by the publication of the confessions of Cullen, Tallo, and Hepburn, the regent would at length reveal the names of those great accomplices who had hitherto escaped. But Moray had neither the power nor the will to make this exposure. The trials were shamefully hurried over. The culprits were arraigned, convicted, and executed in one day, (January 3.) Although Hepburn of Bolton, in his speech on the scaffold, directly asserted that Argyle, Huntly, and Lethington had subscribed to the bond for the murder, no arrest of these persons followed; the judicial confessions which were made by him and his accomplices were suppressed at the time; and, when subsequently brought forward to be exhibited in England, it was found that they had been manifestly tampered with, and contained evidence against no one but themselves and Bothwell.[3]

These proceedings told strongly against the regent, and, making every allowance for the miserable state of the law in these times, it is impossible to exculpate him from the charge of having lent himself to a plan for the defeat of justice. Nor does it need any great discernment to discover both the means by which the truth was suppressed and the motive for such base conduct. Argyle was Lord Justice-General, the head and fountain of the criminal jurisprudence of the country. By his deputy the trials were conducted, and Argyle was a principal accomplice in the king's murder. The confessions were made before the Lords of the Privy-council, and amongst these Lords were Morton, Huntly, Lethington, and Sir James Balfour, all of them parties to the murder. Lastly, Moray was regent of the realm, but he had been placed in the high office by these very men, and his tenure was still so insecure that a new coalition might have unseated him.

Such conduct, although politic so far as his own greatness was concerned, disappointed the people, and was loudly condemned. Handbills and satirical poems, which upbraided his partiality, were fixed to the doors of the Privy-council and of his own house. Of these one was in the following pithy terms:—

"*Quæritur.*

"Why John Hepburn and John Hay of Tallo are not compelled openly to declare the manner of the king's slaughter, and who consented thereunto?"[4]

Another was a pasquinade, of which the truth was more striking than the poetry. It bore the title of a letter sent by Maddé unto my Lord Regent, and the whole estates, and strongly insinuated that Hay and Hepburn

[1] Bedford to Cecil, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., September 16, 1567. Also Drury to Cecil, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., September 30, 1567.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, June 14, 1567, Berwick. Scrope to Cecil, June 16, 1567, Carlisle, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, January 4, 1567-8. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, January 7, 1567-8. Ibid., Forster to Cecil, Alnwick, 11th January, 1567-8. Ibid., Drury to Cecil, Berwick, 21st January 1567.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Questions to be absolved by the Lords of the Articles, 4th January 1567-8.

were about to be hurried out of life and their confessions suppressed, lest they should discover the principal subscribers of the bond for the king's death.[1]

By his partial conduct, Moray not only estranged the people, but it was soon apparent that, notwithstanding all his efforts, he could not long keep his party together. Even in the parliament his legislation on the subject of religion had been condemned by Athole, Caithness, and the Bishop of Moray; and the provision for the ministers of the Church was an unpopular measure with a majority of the lords. He had endeavoured, indeed, to secure the support of the chief nobility and barons by rewards and favours. Lethington had received the sheriffship of Lothian, Hume that of Lauderdale, Morton the promise of the Lord High-Admiral's place, vacant by the forfeiture of Bothwell; Kirkaldy of Grange had been made governor of Edinburgh castle, and Huntly and Argyle were courted by the prospect held out to them of a matrimonial alliance with the regent's daughter and sister-in-law.[2] But even these prizes and promises sometimes failed in their effect, every one being ready to magnify his own merit, and to anticipate a higher distinction than was bestowed. Nor did it escape observation that his conduct since his elevation had become haughty and distant to those proud nobles who had so recently been his equals; whilst he was open to flattery, and suffered inferior men to gain his confidence. Even the vigour with which he punished the riot and lawlessness of the Border district failed to increase his popularity, the kingdom having been so long accustomed to a more relaxed rule that justice was construed into tyranny.

Owing to such causes, it was apparent that Moray's government, soon after the dissolution of parliament, was in a precarious state. The Hamiltons hated him; to Lethington intrigue and change seemed to be the only elements in which he could live; Herries and the Melvils were strongly suspected; Balfour, who knew many secrets, and was capable of any treachery, had left court in disgust; Athole was beginning to be lukewarm;[3] the friends of the Catholic religion resented his late conduct; and the people, never long in one mind, began to pity the protracted and rigorous imprisonment of the queen.[4] All these circumstances were against him; but they were trivial to the blow which now fell upon him, for it was at this very crisis that Mary effected her escape in a manner that almost partakes of romance.

Since her interview with Moray, the captive queen had exerted all the powers of fascination, which she so remarkably possessed, to gain upon her keepers. The severe temper of the regent's mother, the lady of the castle, had yielded to their influence;[5] and her son, George Douglas, the younger brother of Lochleven, smitten by her beauty, and flattered by her caresses, enthusiastically devoted himself to her interest. It was even asserted that he had aspired to her hand, that his mother talked of a divorce from Bothwell, and that Mary, never insensible to admiration, and solicitous to secure his services, did not check his hopes.[6] However this

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office. 4th Jan. 1567-8. A letter sent by Maddé to My Lord Regent and the haill estates:—

"My lordes all, the king is slain,—
Revenge his cause in hand,
Or else your doing is all but vain,
For all your general Band.

"If ye shall punish but *simple* men,
And let the *principal* pass,
Then God and man shall you misken,
And make you therefore base."

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Berwick, Drury to Cecil, Jan. 4, 1567-8. Huntly's son was to marry his daughter; Argyle's brother his sister-in-law.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, Berwick, January 4, 1567-8. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, Berwick, January 21, 1567-8. Ibid., same to same, Berwick, February 2, 1567-8. Also ibid., same to same, Berwick, April 2, 1568.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, 2d April 1568.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, Berwick, September 30, 1567. Melvil's Memoirs, p. 199.

[6] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C.,

may be, Douglas for some time had bent his whole mind to the enterprise, and on one occasion, a little before this, had nearly succeeded; but the queen, who had assumed the dress of a laundress, was detected by the extraordinary whiteness of her hands, and carried back, in the boat which she had entered, to her prison.[1]

This discovery had nearly ruined all, for Douglas was dismissed from the castle, and Mary more strictly watched; but nothing could discourage her own enterprise, or the zeal of her servant. He communicated with Lord Seton and the Hamiltons; he carried on a secret correspondence with the queen; he secured the services of a page who waited on his mother, called little Douglas, and by his assistance at length effected his purpose. On the evening of the 2d of May, this youth, in placing a plate before the castellan, contrived to drop his napkin over the key of the gate of the castle, which, for security, was always placed beside him when at supper, and carried it off unperceived: he hastened to the queen, and hurrying down to the outer gate, they threw themselves into the little boat which lay there for the service of the garrison. At that moment Lord Seton and some of her friends were intently observing the castle from their concealment on a neighbouring hill; a party waited in the village below, while, nearer still, a man lay watching on the brink of the lake.[2] They could see a female figure, with two attendants, glide swiftly from the outer gate. It was Mary herself, who, breathless with delight and anxiety, sprung into the boat, holding a little girl, one of her maidens, by the hand; while the page, by locking the gate behind them, prevented immediate pursuit. In a moment her white veil with its broad red fringe (the concerted signal of success) was seen glancing in the sun; the sign was recognised and communicated; the little boat, rowed by the page and the queen herself, touched the shore; and Mary, springing out with the lightness of recovered freedom, was received first by George Douglas, and almost instantly after by Lord Seton and his friends. Throwing herself on horseback, she rode at full speed to the Ferry, crossed the Firth, and galloped to Niddry Castle, having been met on the road by Lord Claud Hamilton, with fifty horse. Here she took a few hours' rest, wrote a hurried despatch to France, despatched Hepburn of Riccarton to Dunbar, with the hope that the castle would be delivered to her, and commanded him to proceed afterwards to Denmark, and carry to his master, Bothwell, the news of her deliverance.[3] Then, again taking horse, she galloped to Hamilton, where she deemed herself in safety.

The news of her escape flew rapidly through the kingdom, and was received with joy by a large portion of her nobility, who crowded round her with devoted offers of homage and support. The Earls of Argyle, Cassillis, Eglinton, and Rothes; the Lords Somerville, Yester, Livingston, Herries, Fleming, Ross, Borthwick, and many other barons of power and note crowded to Hamilton. Orders were sent by them to put their vassals and followers in instant motion, and Mary soon saw herself at the head of six thousand men.

She now assembled her council, declared to them that her demission of the government, and consent to the coronation of her son, had been extorted by the imminent fear of death, and appealed for the truth of the statement to Robert Melvil, who stood beside her and solemnly confirmed it. An act of council was then passed,

Drury to Cecil, April 2, 1568. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, ——— to Cecil, May 9, 1568.

[1] Keith, p. 470.

[2] Proofs and Illustrations, No. XXI., from the MSS. of Prince Labanoff; and Letter of Kirkaldy to Lochleven, Morton MSS.

[3] Proofs and Illustrations, No. XXI. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, April 2, 1568. Also MS. Letter, Copy, State-paper Office, ——— to Cecil, May 9, 1568. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, May 26, 1568. Also Memoir towards Riccartoun, MS. State-paper Office. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Willok to Cecil, 31st May 1568.

declaring all the late proceedings by which Moray had become regent treasonable and of none effect; and a bond drawn up by the nobility for the defence of their sovereign, and her restitution to her crown and kingdom, which, in the enthusiasm of the moment, was signed by nine earls, nine bishops, eighteen lords, twelve abbots and priors, and nearly one hundred barons. But the queen, though encouraged by this burst of loyalty, felt a desire to avoid the misery of a civil contest, and in this spirit sent a message to Moray with offers of reconciliation and forgiveness.[1]

The regent was in Glasgow, a city not eight miles from Mary's camp at Hamilton, engaged in public business, and attended only by the officers of the law and his personal suite, when almost at the same instant he received news of the queen's escape and her overtures for a negotiation. It was a trying crisis—one of those moments in the life of a public man which test his judgment and his courage. Already the intelligence, though but a few hours old, had produced an unfavourable effect upon his party. Some openly deserted, and sought the queen's camp; others silently stole away; many wavered; and not a few, whilst they preserved the show of fidelity, secretly made preparations for joining the enemy.

Under these difficult circumstances Moray exhibited that rapid decision and clearness of judgment which mark a great man. When counselled to retire, he instantly rejected the advice. "Retreat," said he, "must not for a moment be contemplated. It is certain ruin; it will be construed into flight, and every hour's delay will strengthen the queen and discourage our adherents. Our only chance is in an instantaneous attack before Huntly, Ogilvy, and the northern men, have joined the royal force." Pretending, however, to deliberate upon the offers of negotiation, he gained a brief respite: this he used to publish a proclamation, in which he declared his determination to support the king's government; and sending information to the Merse, Lothian, and Stirlingshire, was rapidly joined by a considerable body of his friends. Morton, Glencairn, Lennox, and Semple lost no time, but marshalled their strength and advanced by forced marches to Glasgow:[2] Mar despatched reinforcements and cannon from Stirling; Grange, whose veteran experience in military affairs was of infinite value at such a moment, took the command of the horse; and Moray had the good sense to intrust to him the general arrangements for the approaching battle. Hume, also a skilful soldier, not only foiled Hepburn of Riccarton in his attempt to seize Dunbar for the queen,[3] but kept the Mersemen from declaring for her, and soon joined the regent with six hundred men, whilst Edinburgh beat up for recruits and sent a small force of hagbutters. The effects which so invariably follow decision and confidence were soon apparent, and in ten days Moray commanded an army of four thousand men.[4]

Amid these preparations Mary sent her servant, John Beaton, to England and the French court, soliciting support. In return, the English queen resolved to despatch Dr Leighton into Scotland with her warm congratulations, and an assurance that if her sister would submit the decision of her affairs to his royal mistress and abstain from calling in any foreign aid, she would speedily either persuade or compel her subjects to acknowledge her authority.[5] It hap-

[1] Keith, p. 475. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 8th May 1568. Endorsed in Cecil's hand, "Band of 9 Earls, 9 Bishops, 18 Lords, and others for defence of the Queen of Scots." Melvil's Memoirs, p. 200. Also Drury to Cecil, May 7, 1568. Keith, p. 474.

[2] Drury to Cecil, May 7, 1568. Keith, p. 474. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, Berwick, May 10, 1568. Proclamation of the King of Scots, May 7, 1568, broadside, State-paper Office; printed by Lekprevik. Also ibid., MS. Proclamation of the Regent for the gathering of the country, May 3, 1568.

[3] Drury to Cecil, May 6, 1568. Keith, p. 474.

[4] MS., State-paper Office, Advertisements of the Conflict in Scotland, May 16, 1568. See Proofs and Illustrations, No. XXII.

[5] MS., State-paper Office, wholly in Cecil's

pened, too, that shortly previous to her escape, Monsieur de Beaumont, an ambassador from Henry, had arrived from France to solicit, as he affirmed, an interview with the captive princess, which had been positively refused. Some suspected that he came to urge the expediency of a divorce from Bothwell, and a marriage between Mary and the Lord of Arbroath, second son of the Duke of Chastelherault. Others affirmed that, like De Lignerolles, his secret instructions were more favourable to the regent than the queen; but however this may be, he now resorted to the camp at Hamilton, and apparently exerted himself to procure a reconciliation between the two factions.[1]

We have already seen that this was agreeable to Mary's own wishes. Her inclination from the first had been to avoid a battle, to retire to Dumbarton, a fortress which had been all along kept for her by Lord Fleming, and to regain by degrees her influence over her nobility and her people. In this wise and humane policy she was opposed by the ambition and fierce impatience of the Hamiltons, who, seeing themselves the strongest party, deemed the moment favourable to crush Moray for ever, and to obtain an ascendency over the queen and the government.[2]

So far, however, Mary's influence prevailed, that they consented to march from Hamilton to Dumbarton; and Moray, congratulating himself upon their resolution, immediately drew out his little army on the Burghmuir of Glasgow, resolved to watch their movements, and, if possible, bring them to an engagement. For this purpose Grange had previously examined the ground, and the moment he became aware that the queen's army kept the south side of the river, the regent's camp being on the opposite bank, he mounted a hagbutter behind each of his horsemen, rapidly forded the Clyde, and placed them at the village of Langside, amongst some cottages, hedges, and little yards or gardens which skirted each side of a narrow lane, through which the queen's troops must defile.[3]

Whilst this manœuvre was successfully performing, Moray, who led the main battle, and Morton, who commanded the vanguard or advance, crossed the river by a neighbouring bridge and drew up their men; a movement which was scarcely completed when the queen's vanguard, two thousand strong, and commanded by Lord Claud Hamilton, attempting to carry the lane, was received by a close and deadly fire from the hagbutters in the hedges and cottage gardens. This killed many, drove them back, and threw their ranks into confusion; but, confident in their numbers, they pressed forward up the steep of the hill, so that the men were already exhausted when they suddenly found themselves encountered by Moray's advance, which was well breathed, and in firm order. It was composed of the flower of the Border pikemen. Morton, who led it, with Hume, Ker of Cessford, and the barons of the Merse, all fought on foot; and when the first charge took place, Grange's clear voice was heard above the din of battle, calling to them to keep their pikes shouldered till the enemy had levelled theirs, and then to push on.[4] They obeyed him, and a severe conflict took place. It was here only that there was hard fighting; and Sir James Melvil, who was present, describes the long pikes as so closely crossed and interlaced, that, when the soldiers behind discharged their pistols, and threw them or the staves of their shattered weapons in the faces of their enemies, they never reached the ground, but remained lying on the spears.[5]

hand, "Instructions for Mr Thomas Leighton, sent into Scotland."

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Forster to Cecil, Alnwick, April 30, 1568. Also, MS., State-paper Office, Advertisements of the Conflict in Scotland, Keith, p. 478.

[2] Memoirs of James the Sext, p. 25. Melvil's Memoirs, p. 200.

[3] Melvil's Memoirs, pp. 200, 201.

[4] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 201. MS., State-paper Office, Advertisements of the Conflict in Scotland, May 16, 1568.

[5] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 201.

For some time the conflict was doubtful, till Grange, perceiving the right wing of the regent's advance (consisting of the Renfrewshire barons) beginning to give way, galloped to the main battle, and brought Lindsay, Lochleven, Sir James Balfour, and their followers to reinforce the weak point. This they did effectually, and their attack was so furious that it broke the queen's ranks and threw all into confusion. Moray, who had hitherto stood on the defensive, contenting himself with repulsing the enemy's cavalry, which was far superior in numbers and equipment to his own, now seized the moment to charge with the main battle, and the flight became universal.[1] At this instant, too, the chief of the Macfarlanes, and two hundred of his Highlanders, broke in upon the scattered fragments of the army with the leaps and yells peculiar to their mode of fighting,[2] and the pursuit would have been sanguinary but for the generous exertions of the regent, who called out to save the fugitives, and employed his cavalry, with Grange who commanded them, not as instruments of slaughter but of mercy. This decisive battle lasted only three quarters of an hour. On the queen's side there were but three hundred slain—some accounts say only half that number.[3] On the regent's only a single soldier fell. Ten pieces of brass cannon were taken, and many prisoners of note. Amongst the rest, the Lords Seton and Ross; the masters, or eldest sons of the Earls of Eglinton and Cassillis; the sheriff of Ayr; the Sheriff of Linlithgow, a Hamilton, who bore their standard in the vanguard; the Lairds of Preston, Innerwick, Pitmilly, Balwearie, Boyne, and Trabrown; Robert Melvil and Andrew Melvil; two sons of the Bishop of St Andrews, and a son of the Abbot of Kilwinning. It was reported that Argyle was made prisoner, but purposely suffered to escape. On the regent's side, Hume, Ochiltree, and Andrew Car of Faudonside, were severely wounded.[4] Previous to the conflict Mary had taken her station upon an eminence half a mile distant, which commanded a view of the field. She was surrounded by a small suite, and watched the vicissitudes of the fight with breathless eagerness and hope. At last, when the charge of Moray took place, witnessing the total dispersion of her army, she fled in great terror and at full speed in the direction of Dumfries; nor did she venture to draw bridle till she found herself in the abbey of Dundrennan, sixty miles from the field.[5]

On arriving at this place, which was on the confines of England, the queen declared her intention of retreating into that country and throwing herself upon the protection of Elizabeth. It was a hasty and fatal resolution, adopted against the advice of those faithful servants who had followed her in her flight, and must have been dictated more by the terror of her own subjects than by any well-grounded confidence in the character of Elizabeth. Lord Herries, who accompanied her, had taken the precaution of writing to Lowther, the deputy-governor of Carlisle, desiring to know whether his royal mistress might come safely to that city; but such was her impatience, that before any answer could be returned she had taken a boat and passed over in her riding-dress, and soiled with travel, to Workington, in Cumberland. Here she was recognised by the gentlemen of the country, who conveyed her to Cockermouth, from which Lowther conducted her with all respect and honour to Carlisle.[6] Amongst her attendants were the Lords Herries, Fleming, and Livingston.

[1] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 201. Also, History of James the Sext, p. 26. Also, Calderwood's Account in Keith, p. 480.

[2] MS., State-paper Office, May 16, 1568. Advertisements of the Conflict in Scotland.

[3] MS. Original, State-paper Office, Advertisements of the Conflict in Scotland, May 16, 1568. Also, Melvil's Memoirs, p. 202.

[4] MS., State-paper Office, Advertisements of the Conflict in Scotland, 16th May 1568.

[5] Ibid.

[6] MS. Letter, State-paper Office. Papers of Mary Queen of Scots. Lowther to Cecil, 17th May 1568. Also, MS., State-paper Office, Advertisements out of Scotland, 18th May 1568.

While still at Workington, the Queen of Scots had written to Elizabeth describing the wrongs she had endured from her rebellious subjects, alluding to the recent defeat at Langside, and expressing her confident hope that the queen would protect and assist her against her enemies. She concluded with these pathetic words, "It is my earnest request that your majesty will send for me as soon as possible, for my condition is pitiable, not to say for a queen, but even for a simple gentlewoman. I have no other dress than that in which I escaped from the field; my first day's ride was sixty miles across the country, and I have not since dared to travel except by night."[1]

On receiving this letter, Elizabeth felt that Mary was at last in her power, and she did not hesitate to avail herself of the fatal error which had been committed. Her first orders to the sheriffs on the 19th of May sufficiently shew this. She commanded them to treat the Scottish queen and her suite with honour and respect, but to keep a strict watch, and prevent all escape.[2] At the same time, Lady Scrope, sister to the Duke of Norfolk, was sent to wait upon her, and Sir Francis Knollys arrived with letters of condolence;[3] but impatient under these formalities, and anxious for a personal interview, Mary addressed a second letter to Elizabeth, in which she entreated that, as her affairs were urgent, she might be permitted instantly to see the queen, to vindicate herself from the false aspersions which had been cast upon her by her ungrateful subjects, and to dispel the doubts which she understood were entertained. She had sent up Lord Herries, she said, to communicate with her sister, and Lord Fleming to carry a message to France; but she entreated, if any resolution had been formed against assisting her, (a decision which must surely come from others, not from Elizabeth's own heart,) leave might be given her as freely to depart from her dominions as she had freely entered them. Nothing could so much injure her cause as delay, and already had she been detained in the state of a prisoner for fifteen days—a proceeding which, to speak frankly, she found somewhat hard and strange. In conclusion, she reminded Elizabeth of some circumstances connected with the ring which she now sent her. It bore the emblem of a heart, and had probably been a gift of the English queen. "Remember," said she, "I have kept my promise. I have sent you my heart in the ring, and now I have brought to you both heart and body, to knit more firmly the tie that binds us together."[4]

The offer in this letter to vindicate herself in person before Elizabeth was earnestly pressed by Mary in her first interview with Scrope and Knollys. Her engaging manner, and the spirit and eloquence with which she defended herself, made a deep impression on both. She openly declared that Morton and Lethington were cognisant of the king her husband's murder; and Knollys confessed that, although he began by accusing her of that dreadful crime, the sight of her tears soon transformed him into a comforter.[5]

Meanwhile Moray lost no time in following up the advantage which he had gained, and after the retreat of the queen, having made an expedition northward, at the head of a large force, and for the moment put down opposition, he returned to the capital, to let loose the vengeance of the laws against those who had resisted his government. Notwithstanding the accusations of his enemies, no instance of cruelty or revenge can be proved against him: whether it was that his nature was really an enemy to blood, or that he found fines and forfeitures a more

[1] Anderson, vol. iv. pp. 29, 33. The original letter is in French, Caligula, C. i. fol. 68.

[2] Copy, State-paper Office, by the Queen to the Sheriffs, Justices of Peace, &c., of Cumberland.

[3] Anderson, vol. iv. part i. pp. 52, 53. Lord Scrope and Knollys to the Queen, Carlisle, 29th May 1568.

[4] Anderson, vol. iv. part i. pp. 48-50. History of James the Sext, pp. 27, 28.

[5] Id. Anderson, vol. iv. pp. 58, 59, Knollys to Elizabeth, Carlisle, 30th May 1568.

effectual way of destroying his opponents and enriching his friends.[1] These occupations at home, however, did not prevent his cares for his safety on the side of England. As soon as he heard of Mary's retreat to Carlisle, and her offer to vindicate herself before Elizabeth, he sent up his secretary or confidential servant, Wood, to express his readiness instantly to appear in person with the Earl of Morton to answer any charges brought against him; to produce evidence to justify his conduct and that of his companions, and, as Drury expresses it, to enter himself prisoner in the Tower of London if he did not prove her guilty in the death of the king her husband.[2]

This proposal of both parties to vindicate themselves before the Queen of England, and to make her the arbiter of their mutual wrongs, came very opportunely to Elizabeth, as she was at that moment engaged with her council in a deliberation on the proper course to be pursued, in consequence of the flight of the Scottish queen. Knollys had already warned her of the impression made upon the Roman Catholics in the North by her arrival, and had urged the necessity either of granting her assistance, or, if that was held too much, restoring her to liberty. Rumours and speeches, so he wrote, were already blown about the country, exposing, in strong language, the ungratefulness of her detention; and indeed so manifest a wrong was committed by her imprisonment, it involved so flagrant a breach of the common principles of law and justice, that Knollys, an honourable nobleman, felt impatient that he should be made a "jailor," so he expressed it, in such a cause.[3]

Of all this Elizabeth and her ministers were well aware; but in that unscrupulous and accommodating school of politics for which the times were conspicuous, when principle and expediency were found at variance, there was seldom much hesitation which should give way; and it was resolved that, in this instance, honour and justice should be sacrificed to necessity. And here, although I must strongly condemn the conduct of the English queen, it is impossible not to see the difficulties by which she was surrounded: the party which it was her interest to support was that of Moray and the Protestants; she looked with dread on France, and the resumption of French influence in Scotland; within her own realm the Roman Catholics were unquiet and discontented, and in Ireland constantly on the eve of rebellion—if such a word can be used to the resistance of a system too grinding to be tamely borne. All these impatient spirits looked to Mary as a point of union and strength. Had she been broken by her late reverses, had she manifested a sense of the imprudence by which she had been lately guided, or evinced any desire to reform her conduct, or forgive her subjects who had risen against the murderer of her husband more than against herself, the queen might have been inclined to a more favourable course. But the very contrary was the case: her first step after her escape had been to resume her correspondence with Bothwell;[4] his creatures, Hepburn of Riccarton and the two Ormistons, blotted as accomplices in his crime, had frequent access to her. In her conversations with Knollys and Scrope she could not repress her anticipations of victory and purposes of vengeance, if once again a free princess. She declared that, rather than have peace with Moray, she would submit to any extremity, and call help from Turkey before she gave up the contest; and she lamented bitterly that the delays of Elizabeth emboldened the traitors who had risen against her.[5] Was the

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, May 26, 1568.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, May 22, 1568. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, June 17, 1568.

[3] Knollys to Cecil, Carlisle, 2d June 1568. Anderson, vol. iv. part i. p. 61.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, Berwick, 26th May 1568; also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Mr John Willock to Cecil, Edinburgh, 31st May 1568.

[5] Anderson, vol. iv. part i. pp. 71, 791. Knollys to Cecil, 11th June 1568. Bishop of

Queen of England at such a crisis, and having such a rival in her power, to dismiss her at her first request, and permit her to overwhelm her friends and allies, to re-establish the Roman Catholic party, and possibly the Roman Catholic religion in Scotland? After such conduct, could it be deemed either unlooked for or extraordinary should she fall from the proud position she now held as the head of the Protestant party in Europe? So argued the far-sighted Cecil, and the queen his mistress followed, or it is probable in this instance anticipated, his counsel.

It was determined to detain Mary a prisoner, to refuse her a personal meeting, to support Moray in the regency, and to induce him to make public the proofs which he possessed of the guilt of his sovereign the Queen of Scots.

With this view, Elizabeth wrote to the regent, and soon after despatched Mr Middlemore with a message both to him and to the Scottish queen. She informed him in her letter that he was accused by his sovereign of the highest crimes which a subject could commit against his prince—rebellion, imprisonment of her person, and her expulsion from her dominions, by open battle. She admonished him to forbear from all hostility; and as her royal sister, who would observe the same abstinence, was content to commit to her the hearing and ordering of her cause, she required him to bring forward his defences against the crimes of which he was accused.[1]

Before repairing to Moray in Scotland, Middlemore was admitted to an interview with Mary, at Carlisle. He informed her that his mistress disclaimed all idea of keeping her a prisoner, her present detention at Carlisle having no other object than to save her from her enemies. As to a personal interview, that was at present impossible. She was accused of being an accomplice in a foul and horrible crime, the murder of her husband. She had made choice of the Queen of England to be the only judge of her cause, and care must be taken not to prejudice her defence, and give a handle to her enemies, by admitting her to her presence before trial had been made of her innocence.

At these words *judge* and *trial*, which escaped Middlemore, Mary's spirit rose, and she at once detected and exposed the artful diplomacy of which she was about to be made the victim. It was God, she exclaimed, who could alone be her judge,—as a queen she was amenable to no human tribunal. Of her own free will, indeed, she had offered to make Elizabeth the confidant of her wrongs, to defend herself against the falsehoods brought against her, and to utter to her such matters as had never yet been disclosed to any living being, but none could compel her to accuse herself; and as to Moray, and those rebels who had joined him, her sister was partial. She was contented, it appeared, that they should come to her presence to arraign her, whilst she, their sovereign, was debarred from that indulgence in making her defence. Who ever heard that subjects and traitors should be permitted to plead against their prince? And yet, said she, if they must needs come, bid the queen, my sister, call up Morton and Lethington, who are said to know most against me—confront me with them—let me hear their accusations, and then listen to my reply. But, she added significantly,—I suspect that Lethington would be loath of such an errand.[2]

It had been Mary's idea, from some expressions used by Scrope and Knollys in their first interview,[3] that the English queen would be induced to restore her without inquiry, or at least by an inquiry so regulated as to criminate her subjects without permitting them to reply; but the mission of Middlemore dispelled this notion. She found that not only was she to be

Durham to Cecil, 27th June 1568. MS. State-paper Office, B.C.

[1] Elizabeth to Moray, June 8, 1568. Anderson, vol. iv. part i. pp. 68, 69.

[2] Anderson, vol. iv. part i. p. 90. Middlemore to Cecil, 14th June 1568.

[3] Anderson, vol. iv. part i. p. 55. Scrope and Knollys to Elizabeth, 29th May 1568.

refused an interview with the English queen, but that Moray had been already called upon to repair to England, and to justify his conduct by bringing forward his proofs against his sovereign. Against this she loudly protested, and at once declared that she would endure imprisonment, and even death, sooner than submit to such indignity.[1] Such conduct was, no doubt, completely consonant to her feelings and her rights as a free princess, and may have been quite consistent with her complete guiltlessness of the charges brought against her; but it seems to me that complete innocence would have been impatient to have embraced even the opportunity of an imperfect defence, rather than endure the atrocious aspersions with which she was now loaded.

Moray in the meantime acted with his accustomed calmness and decision. Having received Middlemore's message at Dumfries, hostilities against Mary's partisans were suspended at the request of the English queen, and he professed his readiness to repair to England in person, accompanied by Morton, rather than that the truth should not be fully investigated;[2] but previous to this there was one point upon which he desired to be satisfied. It was evident, he said, that in a cause involving such grave results nothing could be more ruinous for him than to accuse the queen, the mother of his sovereign, and afterwards, as he expressed it, "to enter into qualification with her."[3] Again, if the accusation should proceed, and he was able to prove his allegations, he was solicitous to know what was likely to follow. As to such letters of the Queen of Scots as were in his possession, he had already sent translations of them by his servant Wood; and he would gladly understand whether, in the event of the originals agreeing with these translations, their contents would be judged sufficient to establish her accession to the murder.[4]

This preliminary inquiry, so artful in its object, for it is evident it enabled the regent to arrange or amend his proofs according to the instructions which he might receive from England, was intrusted to Middlemore, who, on his return to the English court, reported it to Elizabeth, and at the same time informed her of Mary's resolution to decline the intended investigation. Cecil's answer was framed with the evident view of being communicated by Lord Herries, who was then at the English court, to his sovereign. It informed the regent that Elizabeth neither meant to promote any accusation of the Scottish queen, nor to proceed to any condemnation; that her single purpose was to settle all disputes, to allow of no faults in her sister, to bring the controversy to a happy conclusion with surety to all parties, and to esteem no proof sufficient till both parties were heard.[5]

Such a declaration must have startled Moray; and had he believed it, it is evident from the cautious tone of his previous inquiries that no accusation of the Queen of Scots was to be looked for from him. But Elizabeth at this moment exerted all the powers of that state craft in which she was so great an adept to blind both Moray and Mary. It was her object to persuade the regent that, whatever might be her assurances to Mary, she really intended to try the cause, and if he could prove her guilty, to keep her where she was,—in prison; it was her purpose, on the other hand, to convince Mary that she would never permit Moray to bring forward any accusation, but quashing all odious criminations, promote a reconciliation with her subjects, and restore her to her dignity. The negotiations were conducted on the part of the Scottish queen by Lord Herries, who was then

[1] Mary to Elizabeth, 18th June 1568. Anderson, vol. iv. p. 97, part i.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, 17th June 1568.

[3] MS. State-paper Office, Moray to Cecil, with enclosure, 22d June 1568.

[4] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 75, Moray's answer to Middlemore, 22d June 1568.

[5] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 89. Answer by Cecil to the Earl of Moray's proposals, 31st June 1568.

at the English court; and, by Cecil's directions, such only of this nobleman's proposals as it was deemed expedient Moray should know were communicated to the regent,[1] whilst from Mary we may believe the same concealment was made of Moray's entire messages.

These artful transactions occupied nearly a month, and were interrupted, not only by the suspicions and delays of both parties, but by the state of Scotland. In that country Moray's unpopularity was now excessive, whilst the queen's friends were daily rising into confidence and strength. The severity of the regent, and the terrors of an approaching parliament, in which the dismal scenes of forfeiture and confiscation were expected to be renewed, had so estranged his supporters and united his enemies, that he began to be alarmed not only for his government, but for his life. A conspiracy for his assassination was discovered, at the head of which were the comptroller Murray of Tullibardine and his brother, the same persons who had acted so bold a part in arraigning Bothwell.[2] The regent was taunted, and not unjustly, with his former activity in prosecuting the king's murder, and his present lukewarmness; and people pointed ironically to his associate, Sir James Balfour, a man universally detested, by his own confession one of the murderers, and now employed by Moray in the most confidential affairs of the government.[3]

To such a height had these discontents arisen, that Argyle, Huntly, and the Hamiltons, uniting their strength in favour of the queen, held a convention at Largs, (July 28,) in which they resolved to let loose the Borderers upon England, and wrote to the Duke of Alva, requesting his assistance in the most earnest terms.[4] Notwithstanding the delays produced by this miserable state of things, Mary and the regent at last agreed to have their disputes settled by the English queen; and Lord Herries, having arrived at Bolton castle, to which place the Scottish queen had been removed, informed his mistress, in the presence of Scrope and Knollys, of Elizabeth's proposals, and received her formal acquiescence. As some controversy has arisen upon this point, it is right to give his very words. He told Mary that Elizabeth had commanded him to say unto her "that if she would commit her cause to be heard by her highness's order, but not to make her highness judge over her, but rather as to her dear cousin and friend to commit herself to her advice and counsel; that if she would thus do, her highness would surely set her again in her seat of regiment, and dignity regal, in this form and order:—first, her highness would send for the noblemen of Scotland that be her adversaries, to ask account of them, before such noblemen as this queen herself should like of, to know their answer, why they have deposed their queen and sovereign from her regiment; and that if, in their answers, they could allege some reason for them in their so doing, (which her highness thinks they cannot do,) that her highness would set this queen in her seat regal *conditionally*, that those her lords and subjects should continue in their honours, estates, and dignities to them appertaining. But if they should not be able to allege any reason of their doings, that then her highness would *absolutely* set her in her seat regal, and that by force of hostility, if they should resist." To this promise, which is quite clear and explicit, Elizabeth annexed as conditions, that Mary should renounce all claim to the crown of England, during the life of the queen, or her issue; that she should forsake the league with France, and, abandoning the mass, receive the Common Prayer after the form of England.[5] This last stipulation was

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Moray to Cecil, June 22, 1568, with enclosure.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., July 20, 1568, Drury to Cecil. Also ibid., same to same, July 31, 1568. Also ibid., same to same, 3d August 1568.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, July 10, 1568.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, 3d August 1568. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lords of Scotland to Duke of Alva.

[5] Anderson, vol. iv. part i. pp. 109, 110.

added with a view of encouraging some symptoms of a disposition to be converted to the Church of England, which had recently appeared in Mary, who had received an English chaplain, and "had grown to a good liking of the Common Prayer."[1]

These proposals the Queen of Scots embraced after some hesitation, and commissioners would have been immediately appointed for the trial of this great cause, but for the melancholy state of Scotland. In this country, Huntly and Argyle kept the field at the head of a large force; and, having completely reduced under the queen's power the northern and western parts of the kingdom, were rapidly advancing to the south. Their object was to crush Moray before he could hold the parliament, in which they expected the vengeance of the laws to be let loose against themselves; but their march was arrested by letters from their sovereign, who commanded her friends to desist from hostilities, informing them that Elizabeth would compel the regent to the same course.[2] This order on Mary's side was obeyed; on Moray's, if indeed ever sent by the English queen, it was openly violated; for scarce were his rivals dispersed, than the Parliament met, (18th August,) and, had it not been for the remonstrances of Lethington, not a baron who had espoused the cause of the queen would have been left unproscribed. As it was, all his efforts could not save the Archbishop of St Andrews, Lord Claud Hamilton, the Bishop of Ross, and many others, who were declared traitors, and forfeited.[3] It was in vain that the lords of Mary's party complained of this cruel and unjust conduct, and prepared for revenge. Moray, forgetful of his promises, anticipated their attack, hastily levied a force, overran Annandale and Galloway, and would have reduced all opposition by fire and sword, had not his progress been interrupted by a peremptory message from Elizabeth, who commanded him instantly to lay down his arms, and send commissioners to York to answer for his conduct to his sovereign. If this was delayed or resisted, she declared her resolution instantly to set Mary at liberty, and assist her against her enemies; adding, that his refusal would convince her of his mistress's innocence and his own guilt.[4]

This mandate Moray did not dare to disobey, whatever may have been his wishes and regrets. He distrusted Elizabeth; he dreaded increasing his unpopularity with the nobles, by openly bringing forward so odious an accusation against his sovereign; he saw that success was doubtful—failure absolute ruin; and when he proposed to select commissioners, all shrunk from so invidious an office. But he had advanced too far to retract; and, digesting as he best could the mortification of being arrested in the course of his victories, he determined to appear personally at York, and appointed four commissioners to accompany him. These were the Earl of Morton, the Bishop of Orkney, Lord Lindsay, and the Commendator of Dunfermline. To them he added some assistants, the most noted of whom were Lethington, the secretary, whom he had begun to suspect of a leaning to the queen's cause, and dreaded to leave behind him, the celebrated Buchanan, and Mr James Makgill. Elizabeth now directed the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Sussex, and Sir Ralph Sadler to appear upon her part; and nothing remained but for Mary to appoint her commissioners.[5]

Previous to this, she desired to have a consultation with Lesley, the bishop of Ross; and, on his repair to Bolton, this able and attached servant expressed his sorrow that she had agreed to any conference wherein her subjects should be accused, as Moray and his friends, he said, would undoubtedly utter all they could for their defence, although it were to her dishonour and that of the whole realm; it was vain, he added, to expect that

[1] Knollys to Cecil, 28th July. Anderson, vol. iv. part i. p. 113.
[2] Anderson, vol. iv. part i. pp. 125, 126.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Camden, apud Kennet, vol. ii. p. 412.
[5] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 109.

they would openly acknowledge themselves to be ill subjects, and she a good princess; and it would, in his opinion, be far better to endeavour to bring about an amicable arrangement without any accusation on either side. To this Mary's answer, as reported by Lesley himself, was remarkable. She declared there was no such danger to be apprehended as he supposed, since the judges would be favourable to her, and she was already assured of the good-will of the Duke of Norfolk, who had sent her a message to Bolton, expressive of his attachment to her interests.[1]

At this moment Robert Melvil arrived at Bolton with important despatches from Lethington to Mary. He stated that Moray was determined to utter everything he could against her, and had carried with him to York the "letters which he had to produce in proof of the murder;" he sent her, by the same messenger, copies of these letters which he had clandestinely procured; he assured her that nothing but a desire to do her service had induced him to come into England, and begged her to send word by Melvil to York what she thought it best for him to do. Mary, after having carefully examined these letters, which were only the translations from the original French into the Scottish language, sent her answer to Lethington. It is worthy of note that it contained no assertion as to the forgery or interpolation of these letters, now, as it appears, communicated to her for the first time. It simply requested him to use his efforts to stay the rigorous accusations of Moray, to labour with the Duke of Norfolk in her favour, and to give full credit to the Bishop of Ross.[2]

Having concluded her consultation with Lesley and Melvil, she chose her commissioners. They were the Bishop of Ross, Lords Herries, Boyd, and Livingston, the Abbot of Kilwinning, Sir John Gordon of Lochinvar, and Sir James Cockburn of Skirling.[3] These persons having received their instructions, proceeded to York, where they met the regent, the Duke of Norfolk, and the rest of the judges.

So far Elizabeth had been successful, and the position in which she had placed herself was certainly most solemn and imposing. Before her pleaded the Queen of Scots, so late her rival and her opponent, now her prisoner awaiting her award, and acknowledging that, if restored to her dignity, she would owe all to her interference. On the other hand, stood the regent, the representative of the majesty of his sovereign, and the governor of a kingdom, but now receiving the law from her lips whose superior power he did not dare to resist. To hear the cause were assembled the noblest and the wisest in both countries; and besides this, the misfortunes of Mary had created so great and universal a sensation, that it is no exaggeration when we say the eyes not only of England and Scotland, but of Europe, were fixed upon the conferences now opening at York.

The commissioners, accordingly, having assembled, the proceedings began; but on the very threshold a sharp dispute arose when Norfolk observed that the regent, having consented to plead before Elizabeth, must first do homage to the English crown. The proposition was received as an insult; and Moray, red with anger, was hesitating how to answer it, when the cooler Lethington took up the word, and sarcastically remarked, that when the Scottish monarchs received back again the counties of Northumberland and Cumberland, with the manor of Huntingdon, it would be time to talk of homage; but as to the crown and kingdom of Scotland, both were more free than their own England had recently been, when she paid Peter's pence to Rome.[4] The mention of the point, however, rendered some notice of it necessary, and after the oaths had

[1] Examination of the Bishop of Ross at the Tower. Murdin, p. 52.

[2] Murdin, pp. 52, 53.

[3] Goodall, vol ii. p. 109.

[4] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 206. Lesley's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. iii. p. 15. Also Norfolk to Cecil, Oct. 9, 1568. Anderson, vol. iv. part ii. p. 42.

been administered, mutual protestations were taken.[1] The commissioners of the Scottish queen then gave in their complaint. It stated, in clear and energetic language, the history of the rebellion against Mary, her deposition and imprisonment, the usurpation of the regency by Moray, her escape, defeat, and flight into England, and her confident hope that, by the mediation of Elizabeth, she might be restored to the peaceable enjoyment of her kingdom.[2]

All now looked with eagerness for Moray's reply, confidently expecting that he would bring forward as his defence the accusation of his sovereign, and the promised proofs of her accession to the murder of the king; but, to the surprise and disappointment of Elizabeth, he was seized with a repetition of his former fears; and, instead of proceeding to any accusation, requested a preliminary conference with the English commissioners. Being admitted to it, he desired to know whether they would grant him an assurance that their mistress would pronounce the Queen of Scots guilty or not guilty, according to the proofs which he laid before them; and, in the event of the conviction of the murder, whether the Queen of England would sanction his proceedings, maintain the government of the king, and support him in his office of regent.[3] These questions being remitted by the commissioners to Elizabeth, he gave in his defence, which produced new astonishment. It rested solely on Mary's marriage with Bothwell, and detailed the shameful circumstances by which it was accompanied, with the necessity of rising in arms to defend the prince, and of subjecting the queen to a temporary imprisonment, during which she voluntarily resigned the crown. It added not a syllable, directly or indirectly, accusing Mary of being an accomplice in the murder, and did not even contain a hint or an allusion from which it could be gathered that the regent ever entertained such a suspicion, (October 10th.[4])

It was difficult to account for this sudden and unexpected moderation upon the part of Moray. A few weeks only had elapsed since he had been loud in his accusations, and testified the utmost eagerness to bring forward his proofs. He was now silent on the subject; his defence was general, almost to feebleness; and when, after a few days' interval, it was replied to by Mary's commissioners, who urged, forcibly and triumphantly, the coalition between Bothwell and the lords, his trial and acquittal, and their subsequent recommendation of him as a husband to the queen, he sat down apparently dispirited and confuted, and declined saying another word upon the subject.

A secret intrigue, of which we have already had some slight intimation from Mary's conversation with the Bishop of Ross, furnishes us with a key to all this mystery. It originated in the ambition of the Duke of Norfolk, a nobleman then, perhaps, the most powerful subject in England, and who had long been a favourer of Mary's title to the crown. There seems, too, to be little doubt that for some time Norfolk had entertained the idea of a marriage with the Scottish queen, and that he deprecated the present proceedings against her in the strongest manner, although he dared not refuse the task imposed upon him by Elizabeth. These feelings, which he had secretly imparted to the Scottish queen through his sister, Lady Scrope, who waited on her, she had, as we have seen, communicated to Lethington and the Bishop of Ross; and Lethington, on his arrival at York, procured a secret interview with Norfolk.[5]

On this occasion, the duke expressed his astonishment that he and Moray

[1] Anderson, vol. iv. part ii. pp. 49, 50.
[2] Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 123, 126.
[3] Ibid, vol. ii. p. 130, 131. Oct. 9th, pp. 126, 127.
[4] Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 139, 144; and Dépêches de la Motte Fenelon, published by Mr P. Cooper, vol. i. pp. 17, 18, a very valuable work.
[5] Examination of the Bishop of Ross, Murdin, p. 53.

should so far forget their honour as to accuse their sovereign before Elizabeth—as if they thought that England was entitled to be a judge or a superior over the kingdom of Scotland. Lethington warmly deprecated the idea, blamed the weakness of the regent, whose own feelings were against the accusation; declared, for his own part, that he was there, as Moray well knew, rather as the friend than the enemy of his sovereign, and professed his readiness to exert every effort to quash the accusation.[1] Norfolk then asked whether he thought in this matter Moray could be trusted, and the secretary affirming that he might, the duke took the regent aside and remonstrated with him on the folly and impolicy of his present conduct. The English queen, his mistress, he said, was resolved during her life to evade the question of the succession—careless what blood might be shed, or what confusion might arise upon the point. As to the true title, none doubted that it lay in the Queen of Scots and her son; and much he marvelled that the regent, whom he had always reputed a wise and honourable man, should come hither to blacken his mistress, and, as far as he could, destroy the prospect of her and her son's succession.[2] "Besides," added he, "you are grievously deceived if you imagine the Queen of England will ever pronounce sentence in this cause. We are sent here, no doubt, as commissioners, but we are debarred from coming to a decision, and Elizabeth has fully resolved to arrive at none herself. Do you not see that no answers have been returned to the questions which upon this point were addressed by you to us, and forwarded to the queen? Nay, you can easily put the matter to a more certain proof: request an assurance, under the queen's hand, that when you accuse your sovereign and bring forward your proofs she will pronounce sentence. If you get it, act as you please; if it is not given, rest assured my information is correct, and all that will come of your accusation will be repentance for your own folly."[3]

This conversation made a deep impression on Moray, already sufficiently alive to the dangerous part he was playing; and when he imparted it in confidence to Lethington and Sir James Melvil, both of them strongly confirmed him in the views stated by Norfolk.[4] From his brother commissioners, Morton and Makgill, and his secretary Wood, who had drawn up the proofs against the Scottish queen, the regent carefully concealed what had happened; but he determined to follow Norfolk's advice, and bring forward no public accusation till he was assured of the course to be followed by Elizabeth. Such is the secret history of Moray's sudden change, and the present moderation of his conduct towards the queen his sovereign.

But whilst a regard for his own interest prevented him from assuming the character of a public accuser, the regent *privately* exhibited to Norfolk, Sussex, and Sadler the alleged proofs of Mary's guilt, consisting of various bonds or contracts and other papers, besides some letters and love sonnets addressed by her to Bothwell, with a contract of marriage in the handwriting of the Earl of Huntly. These letters had been found, as the Scottish commissioners affirmed, in a little silver casket or coffer; it had been given by the queen to Bothwell, and was afterwards with its contents seized by Morton, and they offered to swear that the letters were written in Mary's own hand. Having carefully inspected them, and drawn up a summary of their contents, Norfolk transmitted it in a letter to Elizabeth, requesting her judgment whether she considered them sufficient to convict the queen of the murder of her husband. He added, at the same time, his own opinion and that of his brother commissioners, that the proof was conclusive against

[1] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 206.
[2] Ibid., pp. 206, 207.
[3] Melvil's Memoirs, pp. 207, 208, 4to edit. Melvil's authority here is unquestionable, as he was not only present at York, but the regent made him privy to this secret interview. Also Dépêches de la Motte Fenelon, vol. i. p. 17.
[4] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 208.

her, if the letters were really written with her own hand.[1]

This, however, was confidential, and unknown to the world, so that if matters had terminated here the result of the inquiry must have been considered highly favourable to Mary. She had triumphantly confuted Moray; and, after his boastful speeches, he had shrunk from any open accusation. But Elizabeth was not to be so easily defeated. She had resolved that Moray should publicly accuse his sovereign of the murder; she was convinced that such an event would be of the greatest service to England whether the Scottish queen was to be restored to her dignity or detained a prisoner; and with this view she suddenly removed the conferences to Westminster, affirming that York was too distant to allow of a speedy settlement of the controversy, and taking particular care that neither Mary nor her commissioners should suspect any sinister intention upon her part.[2] How artfully this was managed appears by the original draft of the English queen's letter, still preserved, and partly in Cecil's handwriting. In it Norfolk and his companions were instructed to be especially careful that the Queen of Scots' commissioners should gather no suspicion of the ill success of her cause, but imagine that this new measure was solely intended to accelerate their mistress's restoration to her dignity on safe and honourable terms, both for herself and her subjects.[3]

It happened that at this moment Moray had made a secret overture to Mary, which rendered this queen less likely to dread any disadvantage to her cause from the removal of the conferences to London. He had sent Robert Melvil to Bolton, to propose scheme, by which all necessity for a accusing his sovereign should be removed, and an amicable compromise take place. The Scottish queen was to ratify her demission of the crown, which had been made in Lochleven, the regent was to be confirmed in his government, and Mary was to tarry in England, under the protection of Elizabeth, and with a revenue suitable to her royal dignity. On these conditions Moray was contented to be silent; and although at first the captive princess professed much unwillingness to agree to such terms, she was at length convinced by the arguments of Melvil, that such a settlement of the controversy was the best for her interest and honour. She therefore despatched Melvil to carry her consent to Moray;[4] she wrote to the English queen, expressing her entire satisfaction that her cause and her honour were now placed in her hands, where she most wished them to be,[5] and she despatched four of her commissioners, Boyd, Herries, the Bishop of Ross, and the Abbot of Kilwinning, to London.

On their arrival Elizabeth admitted them to an audience; assured them that she had carefully weighed all that had been done at York; that the enemies of the Queen of Scots appeared to her to have entirely failed in their defence, as far as they had yet pleaded; and, that their only course was to acknowledge their offences, return to their allegiance, and intercede for pardon, which she would labour to procure them. For this purpose she had removed the conferences to London, and to make the settlement more solemn, had joined some other commissioners to those already named. Nothing now remained but to proceed with the business, first ascertaining whether Moray had anything further to say in his defence.[6]

When the regent repaired along with Lethington and Makgill to London, it was with a determination not to accuse Mary, but to remain true to

[1] The Commissioners to Elizabeth, 11th October 1568. Anderson, vol. iv. part ii. pp. 58, 63.

[2] La Motte Fenelon, vol. iv. p. 18.

[3] Original draft, State-paper Office, Papers of Mary, queen of Scots, Oct. 16, 1568, Elizabeth to her Commissioners.

[4] MS. Declaration of Robert Melvil, Hopetoun MS.; also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Knollys to Cecil, 25th October 1568.

[5] Mary to Elizabeth, 22d Oct. 1568. Anderson, vol. iv. part ii. p. 95.

[6] Anderson, vol. iv. part ii. p. 95. Lesley's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. iii. pp. 25, 26.

his agreement to Norfolk; and if anything should occur to render its execution difficult or impossible, to fall back upon his scheme for Mary's demission of the crown, which he had so lately proposed, and to which she had consented. But an interview with Elizabeth alarmed and perplexed him; he found, to his dismay, that she was perfectly aware of his intrigues with Norfolk. The whole transactions had been betrayed by a confidant of Mary to Morton; he had indignantly revealed it to Cecil, and from him it reached the queen. Nor were his difficulties lessened by a message from Mary herself, who informed him that the Duke of Norfolk had forbid her to resign the crown; and without his consent she could not abide by her agreement.[1] Nothing could be more embarrassing than his situation. On the one hand, Elizabeth did not conceal her anxiety, that he should accuse the Scottish queen and bring forward his proofs of the murder. She had everything in her power; she already hinted that, in case of his refusal, it might be found necessary to bring forward the Duke of Chastelherault, whose claim to the regency was superior to his own; and it is scarcely matter of wonder that Moray faltered in his resolution. Yet, should he consent to the wishes of the Queen of England, he must bear the disgrace of betraying Norfolk. On the other hand, if he remained true to this nobleman, his fellow-commissioners were ready to arraign him of treachery to them and to the cause of his sovereign. Under these embarrassments he adopted a middle course, and resolved to prepare the accusation, but not to make it public until he had a positive assurance that the Queen of England would pronounce judgment.

Meanwhile Mary became alarmed at some private intelligence which she received from Hepburn of Riccarton, a follower of Bothwell's, who was now in London, and who assured her that so far from being favourable, Elizabeth was decidedly hostile to her, and would probably succeed in compelling Moray to desert Norfolk and accuse his sovereign.[2] To meet such an emergency she sent additional instructions to her commissioners, by which their powers were limited to the single act of extending her clemency to her disobedient subjects. She added, that if they found any encouragement given to her adversaries to accuse her, they were instantly to demand her personal admission to the presence of Elizabeth, and if this was refused, to break up the negotiation.[3]

The conferences were now opened in the chamber called the *Camera depicta* at Westminster, the commissioners of the Scottish queen having declined to meet in any place where a judicial sentence had been pronounced. They protested against anything which was now done being interpreted against the rights of their mistress, who, as a free princess, acknowledged no judge or superior on earth; and they required, that as Moray had been admitted to the presence of Elizabeth, and had calumniated his sovereign, the English queen should grant the same privilege to the Queen of Scots, and listen to her defence from her own lips. To this Elizabeth replied, that it was far from her intention to assume the character of a judge, or in anything to touch their sovereign's honour; but, that to admit her into her presence was impossible till the cause was decided.[4]

With this answer they were compelled to be content; and having retired, Moray and his friends were called in, when, being informed that the defences recently made by them at York were considered inconclusive, they were required to say whether they could urge anything further in their behalf. To encourage them to speak openly, Sir Nicholas Bacon, the lord-keeper, assured the regent, in reply to the demands made at York, that if the Queen of Scots should be proved guilty of the murder of her

[1] Melvil's Declaration. Hopetoun MS.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Papers of Mary, queen of Scots, Knollys to Cecil, 21st November 1568.

[3] Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 185-187.

[4] Ibid., pp. 188, 189, November 23, 1568.

husband, she should either be delivered into his hands, her life being sufficiently secured, or be kept in England; and he added, that if found guilty, Moray should be continued in the regency, till it was shewn that another had a superior right.[1]

By this declaration Moray was somewhat reassured. He had prepared his accusation, and the paper which contained it was at that moment in the possession of John Wood, his secretary, who sat beside him at the table, and for greater security kept it in his bosom. The regent now rose and declared how unwilling he and his friends had ever been to touch the honour of their sovereign, or to publish to strangers what might eternally defame her; how readily, had it been possible, they would have secured her reputation and preserved their prince, even at the price of their own exile; and he solemnly protested, that if at last they were compelled to pursue a different course, the blame was not to be imputed to them, but rested with their enemies, who constrained them to adopt it in their own defence, and dragged into light the proofs which they had hitherto concealed.[2] Having delivered this protest in writing, Moray prepared to give in his accusation; but before he took this last and fatal step, he required an assurance, under the English queen's hand, that she would pronounce a judgment. To this Cecil replied, "that he had ample assurance already; and it ill became him to suspect or doubt the word of their royal mistress. Where," added he, "is your accusation?" "It is here," said Wood, plucking it from his bosom, "and here it must remain till we see the queen's handwrit;" but as he spoke the paper was snatched from him by Bothwell, the bishop of Orkney, who sprang to the table pursued by Wood, and, mid the ill-suppressed laughter of the English commissioners, laid it before them. The scene, as it is described by Melvil, must have been an extraordinary one. The regent was deeply mortified, and Cecil, smiling triumphantly, enjoyed his confusion; Lord William Howard, a rough seaman, shouted aloud, and commended the activity of Bishop Turpy, a nickname of Orkney; and Lethington, who was the saddest of the company, whispered in Moray's ear that he had ruined his cause for ever.[3]

The die, however, was cast, and the charge which had been so long withheld was now preferred in the broadest terms. The regent stated, that as Bothwell was the chief executor of the horrible murder of their late sovereign, so he and his friends affirmed that the queen his wife had persuaded him to commit it; that she was not only in the foreknowledge of the same, but a maintainer of the assassins, as she had shewn by thwarting the course of justice, and by marrying the chief author of that foul crime.[4] To give additional force and solemnity to this proceeding, the Earl of Lennox, father to the murdered king, at this moment presented himself before the commissioners; and, having bewailed in pathetic terms the miserable fate of his son, delivered to them a paper, in which he accused Mary in direct terms of conspiring his death.[5]

When informed of this proceeding, the deputies of this princess expressed the utmost indignation; they declared that nothing could be more false and calumnious than such a statement; that some of those persons who now with shameless ingratitude sought to blacken their sovereign, were themselves deeply implicated in the murder; and they required an immediate audience of Elizabeth.[6] When admitted to her presence, they complained in strong terms of the manner in which she had conducted the proceedings; they reminded her how carefully it had been provided that, in the absence of their royal mistress, nothing should be done which might affect her honour

[1] Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 201, 202, November 26, 1568.
[2] Anderson, vol. iv. part ii. pp. 115, 118.
[3] Melvil's Memoirs, pp. 210, 211.
[4] Anderson, vol. iv. part ii. p. 119.
[5] Ibid., p. 122.
[6] Goodall, Appendix, vol. ii. pp. 209-213, inclusive.

and royal estate; this, they declared, had been directly infringed; she had admitted her subjects into her presence; they had been encouraged to load her with the most atrocious imputations; it was now, therefore, their duty, as custodiers of their mistress's honour, to demand that, in common justice, she should also be heard in person; and to beseech her to arrest the authors of such slanderous practices, till they should answer the charges which should be brought against them.[1]

This demand perplexed Elizabeth. It was a just and spirited assertion on the part of the Scottish commissioners of their mistress's undoubted right; but the English queen had not the slightest intention of acquiescing in it. She had now gained her first point, Moray having at last publicly arraigned Mary of the murder; but another and greater object remained: she was desirous of getting possession of the proofs of her guilt; of exhibiting them to her council; and either publishing them to the world, or employing them in intimidating her unhappy prisoner into an acceptance of any terms she dictated. Her mode of accomplishing this was artful and politic. It was, no doubt, quite reasonable, she said, addressing the commissioners of the queen, that their mistress should appear to defend herself against so heinous an imputation as the murder of her husband, a crime of which she never had believed her guilty. As for a personal interview, the only reason why she had refused this was on account of the common slander against her; and now, since the accusation had been publicly made, it would be inconsistent, alike with her honour and that of their mistress, to consent to any compromise or agreement, until the regent and his friends had been called upon to prove their allegations. She, therefore, had resolved to send for them and demand their proofs, after which she would willingly hear their mistress.[2]

[1] Goodall, Appendix, vol. ii. pp. 213-219. La Motte Fenelon, vol. i. pp. 38-51.

[2] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 221, December 4.

The commissioners remonstrated against the manifest partiality and injustice of such a proceeding: they observed, that her majesty must, of course, act as she pleased; but, for their part, they would never consent that their sovereign's rebellious subjects should be further heard, till she herself were admitted to declare her innocence; and they ended by solemnly protesting that nothing done hereafter should in any way affect or prejudge her rights.[3] So far everything on their part was consistent and agreeable to the indignant feelings of a person unjustly accused; but their next step is perplexing, and seems not so easily reconcilable with Mary's perfect innocence; for, on the same day, they made a final proposal for a compromise, by which Moray, notwithstanding his accusation, might still once more be admitted to the favour of his sovereign, and the disputes between her and her subjects be settled.[4] They added that this scheme seemed to them most consonant to the first intentions of both the queens. It was rejected, however, by Elizabeth: any compromise, she said, would now affect Mary's honour; better far would it be to summon her accusers, to reprimand and chastise them for the defamation of their sovereign. She would not call for proofs; but if they persisted in their charge, it would be proper to hear what they could allege in their defence.[5]

Such a proposal for a compromise would certainly tell strongly against the innocence of the Scottish queen, had it proceeded from herself, after the accusation brought forward by Moray; but this was not the case. It came from her commissioners alone, and, as they afterwards asserted, without any communication with their mistress. When at last they found it declined, and perceived that Elizabeth had formed a resolution to hear from Moray the alleged proofs of their sovereign's guilt, before she was suffered

[3] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 223.

[4] See Anderson, vol. iv. part ii. pp. 135, 137, for the particulars of this last proposal.

[5] Ibid., pp. 139, 140.

to open her lips in her defence, they resolved to be equally peremptory: as soon, therefore, as the regent was summoned before the English commissioners, the Bishop of Ross and his associates demanded admission; and, coming forward, at once dissolved the conference. They declared, that since the Queen of England was determined to receive from the regent the proofs of his injurious allegations against their sovereign, before she was heard in her presence, they were compelled to break off all proceedings, and they delivered a written protest, that nothing done hereafter should prejudice the honour or estate of their royal mistress. Cecil and the commissioners declined to receive this paper, affirming that it misrepresented the answer of the English queen; but the Scottish deputies withdrew, repeating that they would neither treat nor appear again.[1]

From this moment the conferences were truly at an end, but Elizabeth's object was still to be attained; Moray, therefore, was charged with having defamed his sovereign by an unfounded accusation, and required to defend himself. He did so, by the production of those celebrated letters and sonnets, which Elizabeth had already secretly examined, and of which he now produced both the originals and the copies. Of these, the originals have long since disappeared, and the garbled state of the copies which now exist, and which appear to have been tampered with, certainly renders their evidence of a suspicious nature. At this time, however, both originals and copies were laid before the commissioners, after which the depositions of some servants of the late king, and the confessions of Powrie and others, executed for the murder, were produced.

Having proceeded thus far, and the English commissioners being in possession of the whole proofs against the Scottish queen, it might have been expected that some opinion would have been pronounced by them. Nothing of this kind, however, took place, neither did Elizabeth herself think it then expedient to say a word upon the subject; but, after a short season of delay, she resolved to bring the cause before a more numerous tribunal. With this view, the chief of her nobility were summoned to attend a meeting of the privy-council. There came, accordingly, the Earls of Northumberland, Westmoreland, Shrewsbury, Worcester, Warwick, and Huntingdon, and from some expressions dropt by Cecil, in a letter to Norris,[2] it may be gathered that it was intended, with their advice, to come at last to some important and final decision. Yet this third solemn preparation ended, like the rest, in nothing. After the lords had been sworn to secrecy, the whole evidence against the Queen of Scots was laid before them; and instead of a judgment upon the authenticity of the proofs, and the alleged guilt of the accused, these noble persons contented themselves with a vague allusion to the "foul matters they had seen," and a general approval of the course adopted by their sovereign. Elizabeth next sent for the Scottish commissioners; and, in reply to their demand so recently made for the admission of their royal mistress to defend herself in her presence, informed them that, from the turn matters had taken, it had become now more impossible than ever to listen to such a request. It was easy, she said, for Mary either to send some confidential person to court with her defence, or to permit the English queen to despatch some nobleman to receive it, or to authorise her deputies to reply to the English commissioners. If she still refused to adopt any one of these methods to vindicate herself, she must not be surprised if so obstinate a silence should be interpreted into an admission of guilt.[3]

These specious offers and arguments did not impose upon the Bishop of Ross and his colleagues. They remonstrated loudly against the injustice with which their royal mistress had

[1] Anderson, vol. iv. part ii. pp. 145, 146. December 6, 1568.

[2] Cabala, p. 155.

[3] Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 257, 260, 263, 264.

been treated; they insisted that since she was denied the common privilege of a personal defence, she should be permitted to return as a free princess to her own kingdom, or, if she preferred it, to retire to France; and at the same time, as their services were no longer necessary, they requested their dismissal from court.[1] The queen replied, they might go to Bolton and consult with their mistress, but should not leave England till the conference was at an end. She then addressed to Mary a letter, of which the object seemed to be, to intimidate her into a defence; but so perplexed and capricious was Elizabeth's mind at this moment, that on the next day she changed her measures; and, in a private communication to Knollys, the vice-chamberlain, who then had charge of the Scottish queen, declared her anxiety to proceed no farther in her cause. It appeared to her, she said, a far better method to endeavour to persuade Mary to resign the government into the hands of Moray; whilst the prince her son, for his safety, should be brought into England. She herself, too, it was added, might continue in that country, and this whole cause of hers, wherewith she had been charged, be committed to pepetual silence.[2]

Knollys was directed to manage matters so that this proposal might proceed from herself; but whilst Elizabeth was thus tossed about by so many intricate and contradictory schemes, Mary had transmitted directions to her commissioners which defeated this last artifice. She informed them, that although she still insisted on her right to be heard in person, and adhered to her protestation, it was not her intention to pass over in silence the atrocious calumnies with which she had been assailed; that Moray and his accomplices in accusing her had been guilty of a traitorous falsehood, and had imputed to her a crime of which they were guilty themselves. She then enjoined them to demand inspection both of the copies and the originals of the letters which had been produced against her, and she engaged to give such an answer as should triumphantly establish her innocence.

This spirited appeal, which was made by the Scottish commissioners in peremptory terms,[3] threw Elizabeth into new perplexity, and it required all the skill of Cecil to evade it. Recourse was had to delay, but it produced no change; and on the 7th January the Bishop of Ross required an audience, in which he repeated the demand in still stronger language. His royal mistress, he said, was ready to answer her calumniators, and once more required, in common justice, to see the letters, or at least the copies of the letters which had been produced by her enemies, that she might prove them to be themselves the principal authors of the murder, and expose them to all Christian princes as liars and traitors.[4] This fair and moderate request Elizabeth evaded. It appeared to her better, she said, that Mary should resign the crown in favour of her son; that, on the ground of being weary of the government, she should remain privately in England, and make a compromise with her enemies.[5] It was instantly answered by Ross, that he had his mistress's command to declare that to such a condition she would never agree: if the letters were produced, and she was permitted to see the evidence against her, she was prepared to defend herself. She was ready also to entertain any honourable proposal by which a pardon might be extended to her disobedient subjects, notwithstanding the greatness of their offences; but to resign her crown would be to condemn herself; it would be said she was afraid of a public accusation, and shrank from inquiry: this, therefore, she would sooner die than consent to, and the last words she uttered should be those of a Queen of Scotland.[6]

Elizabeth struggled violently against this determination, and was unwilling to receive it. She entreated Ross

1 Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 267, 268.
2 Ibid., vol. ii. p. 279, Dec. 22, 1568.
3 Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 288, 289.
4 Ibid., pp. 297, 299.
5 Ibid., p. 300.
6 Ibid., p. 301.

again to write to his mistress, but this he steadily refused. She required him and his colleagues to confer with her council. They did so, but it was only to reiterate Mary's final resolution.[1]

It was now become absolutely necessary that the Queen of England should either grant this last request, or refuse it, and pronounce a final judgment. Moray earnestly urged the necessity of a return to his government. From Mary no change of mind was to be expected. The regent was accordingly summoned before the privy-council, and Cecil delivered to him and his associates the definitive sentence of Elizabeth. Its terms were most extraordinary: he stated, on the one hand, that as Moray and his adherents had come into England, at the desire of the queen's majesty, to answer to an accusation preferred by their sovereign, she was of opinion that nothing had as yet been brought forward against them which impaired their honour or allegiance. He declared, on the other hand, with regard to Mary, that nothing had been produced or shewn by them against the queen their sovereign, which should induce the Queen of England, for anything yet seen, to conceive an ill opinion of her good sister; and he concluded by informing Moray that he should immediately receive permission to return to his government.[2] From this judgment, which was virtually an acquittal of Mary, it seems an inevitable inference, that the English queen, after having had the most ample opportunities of examining the letters which had been produced, either considered them to be forgeries by the other party, or found that they had been so interpolated, garbled, and tampered with, as to be unworthy of credit; for no one can deny, that if the letters were genuine, the Queen of Scots was guilty of the murder.

But if Mary was acquitted, Moray also was found guiltless; and these two conclusions, so utterly inconsistent with each other, Elizabeth had the hardihood to maintain. When we consider the solemnity of the cause, the length of the conferences, the direct accusation of Moray and his associates, the recrimination of the queen, the evidence produced, and the impossibility that both parties could be innocent, the sentence of Elizabeth is perhaps the most absurd judicial opinion ever left upon record.

It was followed by a scene no less remarkable. A privy-council was called at Hampton Court, on the eve of Moray's departure. It included the Duke of Norfolk, the Earls of Pembroke, Derby, Bedford, and Leicester, with Sir William Cecil, and Sir Walter Mildmay. Before it were summoned the Bishop of Ross and Lord Herries, on the one side; on the other came Moray, Morton, Lethington, Makgill, Orkney, Balnaves, and Buchanan; and when they were met, Cecil, rising up, delivered a message from the queen his mistress. She had determined, he said, to give the Earl of Moray and his adherents permission to depart for Scotland; but a rumour having arisen that they were concerned in the murder of the king, Moray had desired to be confronted with the deputies of the Queen of Scots, and he now came there to know whether they would accuse him or his adherents, in their mistress's name or in their own.[3]

To this challenge the Queen of Scots' commissioners immediately answered, that in their own name they had affirmed, and would affirm, nothing; but, with respect to the queen their mistress, they had received her written instructions to accuse the Earl of Moray and his adherents as the principal authors, and some of them the actual perpetrators of the murder. They had communicated, they said, their sovereign's letters on this point to the Queen of England—they had publicly preferred their accusation, they had constantly adhered to it—they had offered to defend the innocence of their mistress, they had demanded in vain an inspection of the

[1] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 304, January 9, 1568-9.

[2] Ibid. p. 305. January 10, 1568-9.

[3] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 307.

letters produced against her, and even now, if exact copies were furnished, they would undertake her defence, and demonstrate, by convincing proofs, what persons were indeed guilty of the murder of the king.[1] Moray strongly asserted his innocence, and offered to go to Bolton and abide in person the arraignment of his sovereign. It was answered, that such a step was wholly unnecessary, as her written accusation had been produced to the Queen of England. Both parties then left the council, and next day the regent received permission to return to Scotland, (January 12.)[2]

It remained to dismiss their antagonists with an appearance of liberality, and being once more called before the privy-council, Cecil intimated to them his mistress's consent that the Queen of Scots should have copies of the letters, (the originals having been redelivered to Moray,) but he first required them to procure a declaration, under her seal and signature, that she would reply to the charges which they contained. It was answered, that Elizabeth had already two writings of the precise tenor required, under the queen's hand; to seek for more was only a vexatious delay. The whole proceedings, from first to last, had been partial and unjust. If the regent and his adherents were permitted to depart, why was their royal mistress, why were they themselves, debarred from the same privilege? If the Queen of England were really solicitous that she should enter upon her defence, let her adversaries be detained until it was concluded. To this spirited remonstrance, it was coldly and briefly replied, that Moray had promised to return when called for; as for the Scottish commissioners, they also would probably be allowed to depart; but for many reasons the Queen of Scotland could not be suffered to leave England. Against this iniquitous sentence, no redress was to be hoped for; the deputies could only protest that nothing done by her in captivity should prejudge her honour, estate, or person, and having taken this final precaution, they left the council.[3]

It is difficult, from the conferences at York and Westminster, to draw any certain conclusion as to the probability of Mary's guilt or innocence. Both Elizabeth and the Queen of Scots acted with great art; and throughout the discussions neither the professions of the one nor of the other were sincere. Thus the English queen, whilst she affected an extreme anxiety to promote a reconciliation between Mary and her subjects, was really desirous that the breach should be made irreconcilable, by the accusation of Moray, and the production of the letters. Nor does there seem to be any doubt that Norfolk's assertion was correct, when he assured Lethington she had no intention of pronouncing a decision. On the other hand, it is clear that, during the first part of the conferences, both Mary and her advisers, Ross, Herries, and Lethington, were, from whatever motive, anxious to suppress Moray's charge; that they deprecated the production of his evidence; and were only induced to go into the investigation from the hope which Elizabeth held out that she would not permit an accusation, but exert herself, under all circumstances, to promote a reconciliation between the Scottish queen and her subjects, and restore her to the throne. It must have struck the reader, that whenever, by means of the private letters which have been preserved, we get behind the scenes, and are admitted to Mary's secret consultations with her commissioners, or to their own opinion on the conduct of the cause, we meet with no assertion of the forgery of the letters; and it seems to me difficult to reconcile her agreement to resign the crown, and suppress all inquiry—a measure only prevented by the interference of Norfolk—with her absolute innocence. On the other hand, there are some circumstances, especially occurring during the latter part of the conferences, which tell strongly in her

[1] Goodall, vol. ii. p 308.
[2] Ibid., p. 309.
[3] Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 310, 313.

favour. The urgency with which, from first to last, she solicited a personal interview with Elizabeth, and promised, if it were granted, to go into her defence; the public and oft-repeated assertion of the forgery of the letters, and the offer to prove this if copies were furnished to her commissioners; Elizabeth's evasion of this request; her entire suppression of these suspicious documents; their subsequent disappearance; and the schemes of Norfolk for a marriage with Mary; these are all circumstances which seem to me exceedingly irreconcilable with her being directly guilty of the murder of her husband. Upon the whole, it appears to me that, in the present state of the controversy, we are really not in possession of evidence sufficient to enable any impartial inquirer to come to an absolute decision. I have already pointed out, as the circumstances occurred, such moral evidence against the queen as arose out of her conduct both before and after her marriage with Bothwell. The discussions at York and Westminster do not materially affect this evidence, either one way or the other; and, so far as we judge of these conferences by themselves, they leave the mind under the unsatisfying and painful impression that the conduct of the Scottish queen throughout the whole investigation, was that of a person neither directly guilty, nor yet wholly innocent.

But whilst animadverting on the proceedings of Elizabeth and Mary in these celebrated conferences, the conduct of the regent must not be forgotten. He was then perfectly aware of the accession of both Lethington and Morton to the murder of the king: this both prior and subsequent events proved; yet did he not scruple to bring these two accomplices to England, and employ Morton as his assistant in the accusation of his sovereign. Such a course, which could be dictated only by the ambition of retaining the whole power of the government in his hands, seems unworthy of the man who was the leader of the Reformation in Scotland, and professed an extraordinary regard for religion: it was cruel, selfish, and unprincipled. Nor is this all: making every allowance for the defective justice of the times, it is impossible to defend Moray's management of the evidence against Mary. There can be little doubt, I think, that some letters addressed by this unfortunate princess to Bothwell, did really fall into the hands of her enemies; but the regent's refusal to produce the originals to the accused, and the state in which the copies have descended to our times, evidently garbled, altered, and interpolated, throws on him the utmost suspicion, and renders it impossible for any sincere inquirer after the truth to receive such evidence. If the only proofs of Mary's guilt had been these letters produced at Westminster, the task of her defenders would have been comparatively an easy one.[1] It is the moral evidence arising out of her own conduct which weighs heaviest against her. But to return.

Upon the conclusion of the conferences, the Scottish queen exerted herself to rouse her partisans in Scotland, and animate them to a vindication of their independence against the practices of Elizabeth. Acting by the advice of Cecil, her chief minister, the Queen of England had formed a scheme by which, under the nominal regency of Moray, she would herself

[1] I have purposely abstained from quoting or entering into the arguments of the writers in the controversy which has arisen on the subject of these letters, and of Mary's guilt or innocence. My object has been to attempt, from original and unquestionable evidence, to give the facts; not to overload the narrative with argument or controversy. The reader who may wish to pursue the points farther, will find ample room for study in the volumes of Goodall, of Tytler, my venerated grandfather, of Laing, Whitaker, and Chalmers. Upon the whole, my grandfather's "Historical and Critical Inquiry," as it appears in the 4th edition, London, 1790, may still, I think, be appealed to, not only as the best defence of Mary, but, in a controversy which has been deformed by much coarse and bitter invective, as the most pleasing and elegant work which has appeared on the subject. It is, throughout, the production of a scholar and a gentleman.

have managed the whole affairs of the country. The project, drawn up in the handwriting of its astute author, still exists; the young prince was to be delivered up by Moray, and educated in England under the eye of Elizabeth; the regent was to be continued in his office, receiving, of course, his instructions from the Queen of England, on whom he was to be wholly dependent; and the Queen of Scots was to be persuaded to remain where she was by arguments which Cecil minutely detailed.[1] These insidious proposals were discovered by Mary, and being communicated to her friends, exaggerated by her fears and indignation, raised the utmost alarm in Scotland. The regent, it was said, had sold the country, he was ready to deliver up the principal fortresses, he had agreed to acknowledge the superiority of England, he looked himself to the throne, and was about to procure a deed of legitimation, by which he should be capable of succeeding if the young prince died without issue. Such reports flew from one end of the country to the other, and as he was not on the spot to contradict them, and cope with his adversaries, their effects were highly favourable to the captive queen.

In the meantime, although he had received permission to return to his government, Moray found himself very unpleasantly situated. He was deeply in debt, and although he had lent himself an easy tool in the hands of the Queen of England, she refused to assist him. If, indeed, we may believe Sir James Melvil, who had an intimate personal acquaintance with the history of these times, she really despised him for his subserviency, and enjoyed his distresses. This was not all: the Duke of Norfolk was enraged at his late conduct; he had broken all the promises made to this nobleman; and, as Norfolk commanded the whole strength of the northern counties, through which lay Moray's route homeward, he dreaded being way-laid before he crossed the Border. Nor was such an apprehension without good foundation, as a plot for his assassination, of which it is said both Norfolk and Mary were cognisant, was actually organised, and the execution of it committed to the Earl of Westmoreland.[2] Under these difficulties Moray had recourse to dissimulation. With much address he procured a reconciliation with Norfolk, expressed deep contrition for the part he had been compelled to act against his sovereign, and declared that his feelings upon the subject of the marriage between her and the duke remained unaltered: it was still his conviction, he said, that such a union would be eminently beneficial to both kingdoms, and he was ready to promote it by every means in his power. To prove his sincerity he opened the matter to the Bishop of Ross, he sent Robert Melvil to propose it to Mary herself, he promised to use his influence for its furtherance with the Scottish nobles, and in the end he so completely reassured the duke, that this nobleman procured the regent a loan of five thousand pounds from Elizabeth, and sent the strictest injunctions to his adherents not to molest him in any way upon his return.[3]

With Mary herself, his artifices did not stand him in less stead. Her friends in Scotland were at this time mustering in great strength. She had appointed the Duke of Chastelherault and the Earls of Argyle and Huntly her lieutenants. The two earls commanded the north; the Duke was ready to rise with the whole strength of the Hamiltons; Lord Boyd and other powerful nobles were preparing for action, and had these combined forces been brought into the field, Moray must have been overwhelmed. But at this crisis the queen and Norfolk were deceived by his professions of repentance; and Mary, trusting to his expressions of devotion to her interest, commanded her adherents to abstain from all hostilities. They reluctantly

[1] MS. British Museum, Caligula, C. i. fol. 273, 22d December 1568.

[2] Murdin's State Papers, p. 51.

[3] Lesley's Negotiations in Anderson, vol. iii. p. 40.

obeyed, and the regent congratulating himself on his own address and the credulity of his opponents, returned secure and unmolested to his government.

On his arrival in Scotland Moray dropped the mask, and exerted himself with energy against his opponents. He held a convention of the nobility, clergy, and commissaries of the burghs at Stirling; he procured an approbation of his conduct, and a ratification of his proceedings in England; and lastly he gave orders for a general muster of the force of the kingdom.[1]

On the other hand, the duke, Cassillis, and Lord Herries, as soon as they came home, assumed a bold tone; issued a proclamation, in which the regent was branded as a usurper; mustered their strength, fortified their houses, and shewed a determination to put all to the arbitrament of the sword. But the rapidity with which Moray assembled his army disconcerted them. It was evident, that although willing to enter into terms, he was better prepared than his opponents to act upon the offensive; and after a personal conference with the regent at Glasgow, (March 13,) they concluded a treaty of peace.[2] It was agreed that a convention of the nobility should be held upon the 10th of April for the settlement of the affairs of the country, and that in the mean season there should be a suspension of hostilities. Moray simply insisted that Chastelherault and his adherents should acknowledge the authority of the king. The duke agreed to this, on condition that all who had been forfeited for their obedience to the queen, should be restored, that such measures should be taken for the maintenance of her honour and welfare as were consistent with the sovereignty of the king, and that a committee selected from the nobles on both sides should meet at Edinburgh to deliberate upon a general pacification. It embraced the regent himself, the duke, and the Earls of Huntly, Argyle, Morton, Mar, Athole, Glencairn, and Lord Herries. For his part, Moray stipulated that these noblemen should repair to Edinburgh and return to their estates in security, whilst they agreed to disband their forces and surrender themselves or their eldest sons as a security for the performance of the treaty.[3]

A temporary tranquillity being thus restored, the leaders of both parties repaired to Stirling, where the Archbishop of St Andrews, the Earl of Cassillis, and Lord Herries placed themselves in Moray's hands as hostages; and the regent, in return, released the prisoners taken at the battle of Langside. It was expected that he would next disband his force; but, seizing this moment of leisure, he led them against the Border marauders, who, from the long interruption of justice in these districts, were become formidable to both kingdoms. His expedition was successful, and it was a politic stroke, for it afforded him a good excuse for keeping up his forces, and it taught them confidence in themselves and their leader. When he returned to the capital, it was with spirits animated by victory, and with a secret determination never to lay down his arms till he had compelled his enemies to submit to such terms as he was pleased to dictate.

The 10th of April, being the day for the convention of the nobles, now arrived; and, according to agreement, the duke, Cassillis, Herries, and other nobles who composed the committee, (Huntly and Argyle excepted,) met at Edinburgh. Two points of much difficulty, and almost irreconcilable with each other, were to be settled—the continuance of the king's government, and the restoration and return of the captive queen; but Moray had no serious intention of entering into discussion upon either. When, there-

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Moray to Cecil, 8th February 1568-9. Ibid., same to same, 17th February 1568-9. Ibid., same to same, 25th February 1568-9. Ibid., B.C., Moray to Sir John Forster, 15th March 1568-9.

[2] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 141. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 13th March 1568-9. Heads of the communing between the Earl of Moray on the one part, and the Earl of Cassillis and others on the other part.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, March 15, 1568-9. Moray to Sir J. Forster.

fore, the councillors were assembled, he rose, and haughtily handing a paper to the Duke of Chastelherault, desired him and his associates, before proceeding farther, to sign an acknowledgment of the king's authority. The duke remonstrated: the demand, he said, was unjust and premature, as the regent well knew. The object of this conference was to deliberate on the measures to be adopted towards their captive sovereign: let him propose such measures himself, or listen to him and his friends when they brought them forward. If both parties were agreed upon them, he and his adherents were ready to subscribe to the king's authority; they had observed every article of the late treaty; they had trusted themselves in the regent's power; their hostages were in his hands; their lives and their lands at his disposal; but they had relied upon his honour, most solemnly pledged and signed, nor could they believe that he would disgrace himself by an act of fraud and tyranny. To this spirited remonstrance Moray did not vouchsafe an answer, but ordered his guards instantly to apprehend the duke and Lord Herries. The last nobleman being the most formidable, was hurried a prisoner to the castle of Edinburgh without a moment's delay; the duke next morning shared the same fate.[1]

This outrage was beheld with deep indignation by the country, and estranged from the regent some of his best friends; but it intimidated his opponents, and rendered Argyle and Huntly more inclined to an accommodation. These noblemen wielded the whole power of the northern districts, and had refused to sign the pacification at Glasgow. So deep was their enmity to Moray, that they had accused him in a public paper, presented during the conferences at Westminster, of being accessory to the murder of the king: and since that time they had left nothing undone to support the interests of their sovereign, and destroy the authority of the regent. But the late scenes in the capital had alarmed them; they saw him supported by England; at the head of a large force; his opponents in prison; the southern part of the kingdom reduced to obedience; and they deemed it prudent to enter into an accommodation. Argyle consented to acknowledge the king's authority, and was immediately received into favour. With Huntly, who had acted more independently for the queen, and granted commissions in her name, the arrangement was more difficult. But, at last, all was settled in a meeting at St Andrews, and the northern lord subscribed his adherence to the government, surrendered his artillery, and delivered hostages for his peaceable behaviour, (10th May.)[2] To secure his advantage, the regent immediately led his army into the north, reduced the country, levied heavy fines on all who had risen in favour of the queen, compelled the clans to swear allegiance, and returned, enriched and confident, to hold a great convention of the nobility, which he had appointed to meet at Perth on the 25th of July.[3]

To explain the object of this assembly, we must look back for a moment, and recall to mind the intrigues which had taken place between Moray, Lethington, and the Duke of Norfolk, to bring about a marriage between this nobleman and the Scottish queen. The project had originated in the busy and politic brain of Lethington, it had been encouraged and furthered by the regent, and its success was ardently anticipated by the duke, who carried on a correspondence with Moray upon the subject, and trusted in the end to procure the consent of his own sovereign. A secret of this kind, however, is difficult to keep in a court; and something coming to Elizabeth's ears, she broke forth with much passion, and attacked the duke, who saved him-

1 Melvil's Memoirs, p. 219. History of James the Sext, pp. 39, 40. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Herries to Elizabeth, 5th July 1569.

2 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Lord Hunsdon to Cecil, May 19, 1569, and Spottiswood, p. 229.

3 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Moray to Cecil, Aberdeen, July 7, 1569.

self by his address. He would admit, he said, that proposals had been made to him on the subject by some noblemen. These he could not have prevented, but he had never seriously entertained them, and, indeed, he was not likely to do so, as he loved to sleep upon a safe pillow.[1] His earnestness reassured Elizabeth; and Norfolk, believing that he had lulled all her suspicions, had the rashness and folly to continue his correspondence with Mary.

After some time, the scheme assumed a definite form, and was secretly supported by a large party of the nobility in both countries. Leicester earnestly promoted it, the Earls of Arundel, Pembroke, Bedford, Shrewsbury, Northumberland, and Westmoreland gave it their full concurrence. Sir Nicholas Throckmorton laboured warmly in the cause; even the cautious Cecil, to whom it was early communicated, contributed his advice.[2]

In Scotland, the plan was managed by Lethington, the regent, and his secretary Wood; whilst the Bishop of Ross and the Lord Boyd communicated with Mary, who corresponded with the duke, and professed her readiness to be divorced from Bothwell. Nothing, in short, was wanting, but the consent of Elizabeth and the concurrence of the Scottish nobility. To conciliate and convince the English queen, Leicester proposed that Lethington should repair to England. To insure the second, it was resolved that the matter should be brought before that convention of the whole nobility which was to meet at Perth on Moray's return from the north.

In the meantime, whilst these secret transactions were carefully concealed, the Bishop of Ross, who remained in England, carried on an open negotiation for his mistress's restoration. To this Elizabeth, with the desire of keeping a check over Moray, affected to listen; and Lord Boyd was despatched with some proposals on this subject, to be communicated first to Mary herself, and afterwards, when she had given her consent, to be broken to the Scottish nobility. These articles, Camden affirms, were drawn up by Leicester.[3] They stipulated that the Scottish queen, on condition of being reinstated in the government of her kingdom, should enter into a perpetual league with England, establish the Protestant religion, receive to favour her rebellious subjects, and give assurance to Elizabeth that neither she nor her issue should be molested by any claims upon the English throne. Another article was added on the marriage with Norfolk, but was carefully concealed from the English queen. It recommended this union as the only measure which was likely to restore tranquillity to both kingdoms; and to enforce it more effectually, Leicester and his friends despatched a special messenger, Mr Candish, who accompanied Lord Boyd to Tutbury, and carried letters and costly presents to Mary.[4] To some of the conditions she immediately consented; to others she demurred, and requested time to consult her foreign allies; as to the projected marriage, her sorrowful experience, she said, inclined her to prefer a solitary life, yet if the remaining conditions were settled to her satisfaction, she was not indisposed to Norfolk, provided Elizabeth were consulted, and her consent obtained.[5]

On receiving this favourable reply, Norfolk became impatient to complete his ambitious project. He courted popularity, kept open house, strengthened himself by every possible means, and communicated his design to the French and Spanish ambassadors, who, after consulting their courts, gave him their encouragement and support. Nor did he neglect the Scottish regent, with whom he kept

[1] Trial of the Duke of Norfolk, Jardine, vol. i. p. 162.

[2] Lesley's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. iii. pp. 51, 61, 62. Camden's Elizabeth, Kennet, vol. ii. p. 420.

[3] Camden's Elizabeth. Kennet, vol. ii. p. 419-420.

[4] Lesley's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. iii. pp. 51, 52.

[5] Ibid. pp. 53, 54.

up a close correspondence, and who assured him of his continued fidelity and devotion to his service. It may seem strange that Norfolk should have so long delayed to sound Elizabeth upon his great design, but Leicester, in whom he chiefly confided, strongly dissuaded him from any premature disclosure; and the deeper he and his confederates were engaged in their secret intrigues the more they shrunk from the dreaded task of revealing them to a princess whose violence and severity held them in constant awe.

Meanwhile, though kept in the dark as to the marriage, the English queen was urged to conclude an agreement for the restoration of Mary, on the ground of those articles which had been submitted to her by the Bishop of Ross; and, after a conference with her privy-council, Lord Boyd was despatched upon this business into Scotland.[1] This nobleman carried with him letters to the regent from Elizabeth, Mary, the Duke of Norfolk, and Sir Nicholas Throckmorton; and, meeting Moray at Elgin, on his return from his northern expedition, he immediately laid before him his despatches and instructions.[2] The letters of Elizabeth contained three propositions on Mary's behalf, and she intimated her desire that one or the other of them should be adopted. She might be restored, she said, fully and absolutely to her royal estate; or, secondly, she might be united in the government with her son, and retain the title of queen, whilst the administration continued in the regent till the prince had attained the age of seventeen; or, lastly, she might return to Scotland, as a private person, and be honourably maintained in quiet and retirement. In Mary's own letter, which was brought by Lord Boyd, she briefly intimated her desire that judges should be appointed to decide upon the lawfulness of her marriage with Bothwell; and, should it be pronounced illegal, her request was that sentence of nullity should be pronounced, so that she might be free to marry where she pleased. This request evidently pointed to the projected union with Norfolk, and the subject was insisted on in the letters of the duke himself and Sir N. Throckmorton. Norfolk, in addressing the regent, contented himself with warm professions of friendship, and assured him that, as to his marriage with the queen his sister, he never meant to recede from his promise, having proceeded so far that he could not go back without dishonour. He referred him to Lord Boyd, who was fully instructed by Mary and himself to reply to any doubts which he might entertain, and begged him to believe that he felt for him the affection not only of a faithful friend, but a natural brother.[3]

Throckmorton's letters were addressed both to Moray and to Lethington. To the regent he observed, that the time was come when he must give up all his conscientious scruples and objections; the match was now supported by a party too powerful and too numerous to be resisted; if he opposed it, his overthrow was inevitable; if he promoted it, no man's friendship would be so highly prized, no man's estimation be greater or more popular. In his letter to Lethington, Throckmorton urged the necessity of his hastening to court for the purpose of breaking the affair to Elizabeth. Of her consent, he said, he need have no doubt. She was too wise a princess to risk the tranquillity of her government, her own security, and the happiness of her people for the gratification of her own fancy, or the passions of any inconsiderate individual; and he concluded by assuring him that the wisest, noblest, and mightiest persons in England were all engaged upon their side.

On receiving these letters, the regent, as we have seen, summoned a convention of the nobility at Perth, on the 25th of July; an assembly of the Church was held at the same time in the capital, and commis-

[1] Lesley's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. iii. pp. 54, 55.

[2] Ibid., p. 70.

[3] Haynes, p. 520.

sioners deputed from it to the meeting of the nobles. It was impossible so acute a person as Moray should fail to perceive that the queen's restoration and the proposed marriage, if carried into effect, must be a deathblow to his power; and, whilst he affected to fulfil his engagements to the duke with scrupulous fidelity, he secretly persuaded his partisans to oppose the match with their utmost influence.[1]

When Boyd delivered his letters at the convention, containing Elizabeth's three proposals, the effect of this disingenuous dealing was perceived: Mary's full restoration to her dignity was refused; her association with the young king in the government was also declared dangerous and impossible; but the third scheme for her restoration to liberty, and being reduced to a private condition within her dominions, appeared to them more likely to succeed. The assembly, however, arrived at no definite resolution; and when the queen's letter, regarding a divorce from Bothwell was laid before them a violent debate arose between Lethington and his friends, who secretly supported the intended marriage with Norfolk, and Makgill, the clerk-register, with the leaders of the Presbyterian party. It was argued by the secretary, between whom and Moray there had recently been great coldness, that the divorce might be concluded without injury or disrespect either to the king or the Church. To this Makgill answered, that Mary's own letters confuted him, and insulted their sovereign. The king was their only head and master, yet she still addressed them as her subjects, and subscribed herself their queen. The Bishop of St Andrews was a heretic, a member cut off from the true vine, an obstinate rebel and papist, yet she wrote to him as the head of the Church. To vouchsafe an answer to such an application would be, in some measure, to admit its justice; to grant it nothing less than treason and blasphemy. It was in vain that Lethington attempted a reply, and sarcastically insinuated that they who were so recently anxious for the queen's separation from Bothwell had now altered their tone with unaccountable versatility. He was interrupted by Richardson, the treasurer, who started from his seat, calling the assembly to witness that the secretary had argued against the king's authority, and protested that any who dared to support him should be accounted traitors, and dealt with accordingly. This appeal finished the controversy, and Mary's proposal for a divorce was indignantly rejected.[2] The assembly then broke up with mutual expressions of contempt and defiance, the queen's deliverance appearing still more distant than before.

But if the affairs of this unfortunate princess were thus unsuccessful in her own dominions, an event which now happened in England overwhelmed her with fresh affliction. The renewed intrigues of the Duke of Norfolk were discovered, and Elizabeth's suspicions being once awakened, she never rested till, by the assistance of Cecil, her indefatigable and vigilant minister, the whole plot was unravelled.[3] These discoveries were made when the duke scarcely suspected it, till he was awakened from his security by some dark speeches of the queen, who taunted him with his high hopes, and bade him beware on what pillow he leant his head.[4] But this moderate tone of reprehension was short-lived, for on ascertaining the extent to which the plot had been carried under her own eye, by her principal nobility, and without a pretence of soliciting her consent, Elizabeth's fury was ungovernable. Leicester and his associates hastened to propitiate her resentment by a full discovery, and basely purchased their own security with the

[1] Lesley's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. ii.; p. 71. MS. State-paper Office. Names of the noblemen, &c., assembled at Perth, 28th July 1569.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lord Hunsdon to Cecil, Berwick, 5th August 1569. History of James the Sext, p. 41.

[3] Maitland, vol. ii. p. 1090.

[4] Spottiswood, p. 231.

betrayal of Norfolk. His example was followed by Moray, who with equal meanness, on the first challenge of the English queen, delivered up the whole of his secret correspondence with Norfolk, and excused himself by declaring that a fear of assassination had compelled him to join a conspiracy of which he secretly disapproved.[1] He pleaded also, and with some reason, that Elizabeth's own conduct was enough to mitigate her resentment. If she had adopted a decided part against Mary, they would have known how to receive Norfolk's proposals; but her vacillating policy, and the favour with which the captive queen was treated, created, he said, an equal uncertainty in his mind, and that of his supporters.[2]

As for the unfortunate duke himself, he appears to have acted with that indecision which, in matters of this kind, and with such an adversary as Elizabeth, is commonly fatal. His friends admonished him to throw off the mask and take the field at once, and had he followed their advice his popularity was so great that the consequences might have been serious; but he rejected their advice, and in an apology addressed to the queen, assured her that it had been his fixed resolution throughout the whole course of the negotiations never to marry the Queen of Scots without the consent of his sovereign. His guilt lay in the delay, but his allegiance was untainted, and his devotion to her service as entire as it had always been. This letter was sent from Kenninghall, his seat in Norfolk, to which he had precipitately retired on his first suspicion of a discovery. Elizabeth's reply was an immediate summons to the court. The duke did not venture to obey without first consulting Cecil. The secretary assured him that he was safe. He complied, and was instantly arrested and lodged in the Tower.[3]

The discovery was followed by a more rigorous confinement of the Scottish queen, who was now removed from Winkfield to Tutbury; her repositories were ransacked for letters; and she was committed to the custody of the Earl of Huntingdon, a nobleman particularly obnoxious to her, who was associated in this charge with Shrewsbury, her former keeper.[4] Her most trusty domestics were dismissed, the number of her attendants diminished, her letters intercepted and conveyed to the Queen of England, and all her actions so rigorously watched, that it became impossible for her to communicate even in the most common affairs with her friends.[5]

Nothing can more strongly mark the sudden and extraordinary changes of these times than an event which soon after occurred in Scotland—the arraignment of Lethington. The regent, since the discovery of his intrigues with Norfolk, had fallen into suspicion with Elizabeth. His secretary Wood, also, who had been intrusted with his negotiations at the English court, by his duplicity and false dealing, had incurred her resentment; and although Moray hastened to appease her, by a delivery of the letters which convicted the duke, she was aware that Lethington still intrigued upon the subject, and suspected that the regent, from their long habits of intimacy, might be induced to favour his designs. Her fears, indeed, on this point proved to be unfounded, for Moray, as we learn from Melvil, had recently forsaken his old friends, and suffered himself to be surrounded by a circle of base and needy parasites. But of this estrangement Elizabeth was ignorant. She therefore directed Cecil to keep a vigilant eye upon the operations of the regent; Lord Hunsdon, the governor of Berwick, received the same instructions; the proceedings of the convention at Perth, and the subsequent conduct of the Scottish governor, were severely criticised; and Moray found, to his mortification, that whilst he had incurred extreme

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Moray to Cecil. Hawick, 22d October 1569, Trial of the Duke of Norfolk, in Jardine, vol. i. pp. 157-160.

[2] Ibid., Dumfries, 29th October 1569.

[3] Haynes, pp. 528, 533.

[4] Haynes, p. 526, 527.

[5] Lesley's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. iii. p. 78.

odium by the betrayal of Norfolk, he was himself an object of suspicion.

Whilst Elizabeth, however, only suspected Moray, she was incensed to the highest degree against Lethington, whom she now discovered to be the originator of the marriage plot and the greatest partisan of Norfolk. This restless and indefatigable politician, since his unsuccessful efforts in the convention at Perth, had sought security in Athole, where he was surrounded by his friends, and continued to incite them to renew their exertions in favour of the Scottish queen; and Moray, who, like other victims of ambition, had become sufficiently unscrupulous in the means which he adopted to consolidate his power, resolved to recommend himself to Elizabeth by the ruin of his former associate.

Under the pretence of requiring his immediate assistance at Stirling, in the business of the government, he requested the secretary to leave his retreat in Athole and return to court. Suspicious of some intrigue, he obeyed with reluctance, and scarce had he taken his seat at council, which was attended by Moray, Mar, Morton, Athole, and Semple, when word was brought that Crawford, a gentleman from the Earl of Lennox, requested audience on business of moment. He was admitted, and falling down on his knees, demanded justice to be done on William Maitland of Lethington, and Sir James Balfour, as the murderers of their sovereign.[1] Amongst the councillors, the only one who heard this sudden accusation unmoved was the secretary himself. With a smile of calm contempt he observed, that his long-continued services might have exempted him from so foul and false a charge, preferred, too, by so mean a person; but he was ready to find surety to stand his trial on any day which was appointed, and he had no fears for the verdict. Crawford, however, still kneeling, warmly remonstrated against his being left at large. He, a gentleman, and a servant of the late king,[2] had publicly arraigned that guilty man of treason; he was ready to prosecute and adduce his proofs, and under such circumstances he appealed to the council whether bail could possibly be accepted. After a violent debate it was determined that the secretary should be committed; and Moray, who secretly congratulated himself on the issue of his intrigue, carried him to the capital, and confined him in the house of Forrester, one of his own dependants. At the same time a party of horse were despatched to Fife, who surrounded Balfour's residence at Monimail, and brought him and his brother George prisoners to Edinburgh.[3]

The arrest of Lethington increased the unpopularity of the regent; but his victim had scarcely fallen into his hands ere he was again torn from him; for the secretary's old associate, Grange, dreading some new treachery of Moray and Morton, now closely leagued together, attacked the house in which he was confined, and, by a mixture of stratagem and courage,[4] carried him off in triumph to the castle. This rescue deeply mortified Moray, who believed that in securing Lethington he was not only performing an acceptable service to Elizabeth, but removing the most formidable opponent of his own government. He dissembled his indignation, however; and as the secretary still declared his readiness to answer the accusation, contented himself with appointing the 22d of November as the day of trial.

Meanwhile, England became disturbed by a rebellion in the northern counties, which at first assumed a formidable appearance. Its leaders were the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, its object no less than the restoration of the Roman Catholic faith, the destruction of the Pro-

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Lord Hunsdon to Cecil, Newcastle, September 7th, 1569. Diurnal of Occurrents, pp. 147, 148.

[2] Supra, p. 235.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Moray to Cecil, Stirling, September 5th, 1569. Also, Lord Hunsdon to Cecil, Alnwick, September 8th, 1569. Diurnal of Occurrents, pp. 147-148.

[4] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 218. It is stated by Robert Melvil that Grange, to forward his purpose, forged an order under the handwriting of the regent. MS. Declaration of Robert Melvil in the Hopetoun Papers.

testant constitution of that country, and the delivery of the Scottish queen. So imminent did the danger at first appear, that Elizabeth issued an order under the great seal for Mary's execution, which seems only to have been arrested by the sudden and total failure of the insurrection.[1] It arose from the intrigues of the Duke of Norfolk and the hopes excited amongst the English Catholics by the anticipated restoration of Mary. Amongst Norfolk's most powerful friends were the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, two peers of ancient lineage, powerful connexions, and steady attachment to the Church of Rome. They commanded the strength of the northern counties; and had Norfolk chosen to have bid defiance to Elizabeth, they were ready to have risen in arms in his defence. His submission and imprisonment broke, but did not put an end to, their intrigues; and, irritated at his desertion, they sought the support of the king of Spain, and secured the services of the Duke of Alva and the Bishop of Ross.

This prelate, a man of great talents and restless intrigue, was the ambassador and confidential minister of the Scottish queen, and by his secret negotiations, his mistress, who in her first imprisonment at Bolton had kept up a correspondence with Northumberland,[2] became involved in these new commotions. Alva promised to assist the two earls with a large body of men, and sent over the Marquis Vitelli, one of his best officers, under the pretence of a mission to Elizabeth, but really to forward the rebellion. Before, however, these preparations were completed, Elizabeth obtained a knowledge of the plot, and instantly summoned both to court. Whilst they hesitated, intelligence arrived that Sussex, the queen's lieutenant in the north, had received orders to arrest them; and scarce was this message delivered when Northumberland's castle was beset by a body of horse. He escaped with difficulty, joined the Earl of Westmoreland, and, as the only chance now left them, they dropped the mask and broke into rebellion. An enterprise thus prematurely forced on could scarcely be successful. In their proclamation the two earls professed a devoted attachment to the queen's person, and declared their only object to be the restoration of the faith of their fathers, the dismissal of false councillors, and the liberation of Norfolk. They had confidently looked to being joined by the large body of the English Roman Catholics all over the country, but their utmost strength never amounted to six thousand men, and these soon melted away into a more insignificant force. Sir John Forster, the Warden of the Middle Marches, made himself master of Northumberland's castles of Alnwick and Warkworth, and by taking possession of the principal passes, effectually cut off all communication between the earl and his vassals in those parts. Thence marching to Newcastle, and being joined by Sir Henry Percy, Northumberland's brother, he speedily reduced the rebels in the northern parts of Durham, so that when Sussex took the field with seven thousand men, the rebellion was already expiring.[3]

The two rebel earls, with a force which diminished every hour, retired first upon Hexham, and afterwards fell back upon Naworth castle, in Cumberland. Here they suddenly dispersed their little army, and fled with a handful of horse into Scotland. Westmoreland took refuge with the Lairds of Buccleuch and Fernyhirst, two of the most powerful chiefs in those parts; whilst Northumberland, in company with black Ormiston, a traitor who was present at the king's murder, the Laird's Jock, and other Border banditti, threw himself into the Harlaw, a stronghold of the Armstrongs.[4] These events passed with

[1] See Proofs and Illustrations, No. XXIII. Letter of Leicester to Cecil, communicated by Mr Bruce.

[2] Haynes, pp. 594, 595.

[3] Lingard, vol. viii. pp. 52, 58. Camden, in Kennet, vol. ii. pp. 421, 422.

[4] Copy of the time, State-paper Office, Instructions for Mr George Cary. Signed by Sussex, Hunsdon, and Sadler, 22d December 1569. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office,

so much rapidity, that Moray, who, on the first intelligence of the insurrection, had professed his readiness to assist Elizabeth with the whole forces of the realm, was scarcely able to muster his strength before he heard that assistance was unnecessary.[1]

From such commotions in England, so intimately connected with the fortunes of the captive queen, we must turn to the condition of her partisans in her own country. Of these the great leaders were Lethington and Grange. Grange was in possession of the castle of Edinburgh, within which now lay his friend Lethington, Lord Herries, the Archbishop of St Andrews, and others who supported the cause of Mary, professing at the same time their attachment to their prince, and an earnest desire for the pacification of the country.

Opposed to them was the regent, supported by England and the party of the Kirk, who kept up a constant correspondence with Cecil, Elizabeth's minister, and whose measures were entirely dictated and overruled by English influence.

Since his accession to the chief power in the state, but more especially since the termination of the conferences at Westminster, Moray's popularity had been on the decline. Men blamed his conduct to his sovereign, his treachery to his associates, his haughtiness to his own countrymen, his humility and subserviency to a foreign Power, as England was then considered. They accused him of being surrounded by troops of low and needy flatterers, who prospered upon the ruin of the ancient nobility, and persuaded him to betray his former friends, by whose efforts he had been placed in the regency. They declared, and with some truth, that having once sold himself to England, he had become insensible to every suggestion of honour and good faith. Hence his betrayal of Norfolk, his imprisonment of Herries and the Duke of Chastelherault, his treacherous accusation of Lethington, his threatened severity to Northumberland,—all this weighed strongly against him; and those who had been most willing to anticipate the happiest results from his administration were now ready to acknowledge their mortification and disappointment.[2] Yet, although thus fallen in public estimation, and surrounded by enemies, Moray, naturally daring and intrepid, shewed no symptoms of decreasing energy; and as the time approached when Lethington was to stand his trial for the murder of the king, he appeared fully determined to insist on the prosecution.

When the day arrived, however, a scene presented itself very different from the pacific solemnities of public justice. Lord Home, at an early hour, occupied the city with a large body of horse. He was speedily followed by multitudes of the secretary's friends, all armed and surrounded by their retainers; and as every hour was increasing the concourse, Morton, a principal accuser of Lethington, refused to risk his person within the city. Amidst this warlike concourse, Clement Little, an able advocate of the time, entered where the council had assembled, and protested that, as his client, the secretary, was ready to stand his trial, and no prosecutor had appeared, he was entitled to a verdict of acquittal. Moray, however, who had taken care to be strongly guarded, rose up, and declared that as long as the town was occupied by armed troops no trial should take place, and no verdict be pronounced. He had been placed, he said, by their unsolicited suffrages in the first office in the state; he had given his solemn oath to administer justice; they had promised to obey the king, and assist him in maintaining the law. What, then, meant this armed assembly? Was it thus that they fulfilled their promise? or did they think to intimidate him into their opinion? That,

copy of the time, Moray to Sussex, Peebles, 22d December 1569.

[1] For a more detailed and interesting account of this insurrection in 1569, the reader is referred to a valuable work recently published by my respected friend Sir Cuthbert Sharpe, entitled, "Memorials of the Rebellion of 1569." Nichols: London, 1840.

[2] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 220.

at least, he should shew them was a vain expectation; and therefore he now prorogued the trial till quiet was restored, and they were prepared, having laid aside their arms, to resume the demeanour of peaceable subjects. Such was Moray's speech, as reported by himself in a letter written next day to Cecil; but we learn, from the same source, that the regent was daily expecting a communication from Elizabeth, containing her instructions how to conduct himself in Lethington's case, and that he delayed the trial to give time for their arrival—an additional proof of his entire subserviency to England.[1]

He concluded the same letter by an allusion to the recent rebellion in the north. "I have offered," said he, "already to Mr Marshal of Berwick [he meant Sir William Drury] to take such part in her highness's cause and quarrel with the whole power of this realm, that will do for me, as he shall advertise me; . . . and since the matter not only touches her highness's obedience, but that we may see our own destruction compassed, who are professors of the gospel, let not time drive, but with speed let us understand her majesty's mind."[2]

Moray followed up this offer by summoning the whole force of the kingdom to meet him in arms at Peebles on the 20th December, for the defence of their native country, the preservation of their wives and children, and the liberty of the true religion.[3] He had received early intelligence from Sussex of the flight of the rebel earls into Scotland, and immediately despatched messengers to the seaports to keep a strict look-out, lest any should take shipping and escape. But his chief reliance lay in his own activity; and marching rapidly towards Hawick, he beset the Harlaw, a tower in which Northumberland had found shelter from Hecky, or Hector Armstrong, a Border thief. This villain, bribed by the regent's gold, sold the English earl to Moray, who carried him to Edinburgh, and soon after imprisoned him in Lochleven.[4]

Although this new act of severity and corruption increased the regent's unpopularity in Scotland, it being suspected that he meant to give up his captive to Elizabeth, his zeal and activity completely restored him to the good opinion of this princess, and he had the satisfaction to learn that she had warmly commended him to his ambassador, the Abbot of Dunfermline. This emboldened him to make a proposal on which he had long meditated, and for which the English queen was by no means prepared. It was no less than that she should surrender Mary into his hands to be kept safely in Scotland, a solemn promise being given by him, "that she should live her natural life, without any sinister means taken to shorten the same."[5] It was added that a maintenance suitable to her high rank should be provided for her; and the arguments addressed to Elizabeth upon the subject, in a paper intrusted to Nicholas Elphinston, who was sent with the request to the English court, were drawn up with no little art and ability. After an enumeration of the late miseries and commotions in England, it stated, that "as Mary was notoriously the ground and fountain from whom all these tumults, practices, and daily dangers did flow," and as her remaining within the realm of England undoubtedly gave her every opportunity to continue them, there was no more certain means to provide

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Moray to Cecil, Edinburgh, 22d Nov. 1569, endorsed in Cecil's hand, "Earl of Murray to me, concerning the day of law for Lydington."

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Moray to Cecil, Edinburgh, 22d November 1569.

[3] MS., State-paper office, copy, the Regent's Proclamation, Edinburgh, 18th December 1569.

[4] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 154. Lesley's Negotiations, p. 83. Anderson, vol. iii. Hence a Border proverb, "To take Hecky's cloak," to betray a friend. Percy's Reliques, vol. i. p. 3, song iv.

[5] Copy of the "Instrument," MS., State-paper Office, but without date. On the back are these names, in Cecil's hand,

Er: Murray,	Er: Marshall, M.
Morton,	Lr: Lyndsay,
Mar,	Ruthven,
Glencairn,	Semple.
Montrose, M.	

a remedy, and bring quiet to both countries, than to bring her back into Scotland, thus removing her to a greater distance from foreign realms, and daily intelligence with their princes or their ambassadors."[1]

In this petition Moray was joined by Morton, Mar, Glencairn, Lords Lindsay, Ruthven, and Semple, with the Masters of Marshal and Montrose. At the same time Knox addressed a letter to Cecil. He described himself as writing with one foot in the grave, alluded to the late rebellion, and recommended him to strike at the root, meaning Mary, if he would prevent the branches from budding again. It appears to me that the expressions of this great Reformer, whose stern spirit was little softened by age, go as far as to urge the absolute necessity of putting Mary to death; but his words are somewhat dark and enigmatical. The letter, which is wholly in his own hand, is too remarkable to be omitted.

"Benefits of God's hands received, crave that men be thankful, and danger known would be avoided. If ye strike not at the root, the branches that appear to be broken will bud again, and that more quickly than men can believe, with greater force than we would wish. Turn your een[2] unto your God: forget yourself and yours, when consultation is to be had in matters of such weight as presently ly upon you. Albeit I have been fremedly[3] handled, yet was I never enemy to the quietness of England. God grant you wisdom. In haste, of[4] Edinburgh, the second of Janur. Yours to command in God,

"John Knox, with his one foot in the grave.[5]

"Mo[6] days than one would not suffice to express what I think."

Moray despatched Elphinston on the 2d of January, and as Knox's letter was dated on the same day, and related to the same subject, it is probable he carried it with him.[7] The envoy, who was in great confidence with the regent, and a man of talent, received full instructions for his secret mission, which fortunately have been preserved. He was directed to impress upon Elizabeth, in the strongest manner, the difficulties with which Moray was surrounded; the daily increasing power of his and her enemies, who supported the cause of the captive queen both in England and Scotland; the perpetual tumults and intrigues of the Spanish faction of the Catholics in England, and their brethren of the same faith in Scotland; their intercourse with Philip of Spain and the Pope, who were animating them at that very moment to new exertions; the succours hourly looked for from France; and the utter impossibility of the regent keeping up the struggle against his opponents, if Mary was permitted to remain in England, and Elizabeth did not come forward with more prompt and effectual assistance.

It was necessary, he said, to prevent the ruin of the cause, that the Queen of England and his master should distinctly understand each other. She had lately urged him to deliver up her rebel the Earl of Northumberland, to pay the penalty of a traitor. It was a hard request, and against every feeling of honour and humanity, to surrender a banished man to slaughter; but he was ready to consent, if, in exchange, the Queen of Scots were committed into his hands, and if, at the same time, Elizabeth would support the cause of his young sovereign, and the interests of true religion, by an immediate advance of money, and a seasonable present of arms and ammunition.[8] If this were agreed to, then he was ready to continue his efforts for the maintenance of the government in Scotland against the

[1] MS. Copy of the "Instrument," State-paper Office, ut supra.
[2] Eyes. [3] Strangely. [4] At.
[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, John Knox to Cecil, Edinburgh, 2d January 1569-70. Endorsed by Cecil's clerk, "Mr Knox to my Mr."
[6] More.
[7] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Moray to Cecil, January 2, 1569-70.
[8] MS., State-paper Office, a Note of the principal matters in Nicholas Elphinston's Instructions. Wholly in Cecil's hand. January 19, 1569-70.

machinations of their enemies; he would not only preserve her amity, but "would serve her majesty in England, as they are accustomed to do their native princes in Scotland, and out of England, upon reasonable wages." If she would not consent to this, then he must forbear any longer to venture his life as he had done; and it would be well for her to consider what dangers might ensue to both the realms by the increase of the factions which favoured Papistry and the Queen of Scots' title. Above all, he entreated her to remember, (alluding, as it appears to me, to the subject of Knox's letter,) that the heads of all these troubles were at her commandment; that this late rebellion was not now ended, but had more dangerous branches, for which, if she did not provide a remedy, the fault must lie upon herself.[1]

These secret negotiations were detected by the vigilance of the Bishop of Ross, and he instantly presented a protest to the Queen of England against a proposition which, if agreed to, was, he said, equivalent to signing Mary's death-warrant. He solicited also the ambassadors of France and Spain to remonstrate against it, and La Motte Fenelon addressed an earnest letter to the queen-mother upon the subject.[2] Some little time, too, was gained by the refusal of the Scottish nobles to deliver up Northumberland, and Elizabeth had despatched Sir Henry Gates and the Marshal of Berwick with a message to the regent, when an appalling event suddenly interrupted the treaty. This was the murder of Moray himself in the town of Linlithgow, by James Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh.

The assassination is to be chiefly traced to the influence of private revenge; but there is no doubt, also, that the author of the deed was the tool of a faction which had long determined on Moray's destruction. He was a gentleman of good family, had been made prisoner at Langside, and with others was condemned to death; but the regent had spared his life, and been satisfied with the forfeiture of his estate.

His wife was heiress of Woodhouselee, a small property on the river Esk, to which she had retreated, under the mistaken idea that it would be exempted from the sentence of outlawry, which affected her husband's estate of Bothwellhaugh. But Bellenden, the justice-clerk, a favourite of Moray's, who had obtained a grant of the escheat,[3] violently occupied the house, and barbarously turned its mistress, during a bitterly cold night, and almost in a state of nakedness, into the woods, where she was found in the morning furiously mad, and insensible to the injury which had been inflicted on her. If ever revenge could meet with sympathy, it would be in so atrocious a case as this; and from that moment Bothwellhaugh resolved upon Moray's death, accusing him as the chief author of the calamity. It is affirmed by Calderwood, that he had twice failed in his sanguinary purpose, when the Hamiltons, who had long hated the regent, encouraged him to make a third attempt, which proved successful.[4]

Nothing could be more deliberate than the manner in which he proceeded. Moray, who was at Stirling, intended to pass through Linlithgow, on his way to Edinburgh. In this town, and in the High Street, through which the cavalcade generally passed, was a house belonging to the archbishop, uncle to Bothwellhaugh. Here the assassin took his station in a small room, or wooden gallery, which commanded a full view of the street. To prevent his heavy footsteps being heard, for he was booted and spurred, he placed a feather bed on the floor; to secure against any chance observation of his shadow, which, had the sun broke out, might have caught the eye, he hung up a black

[1] MS., State-paper Office, a Note of the principal matters in Nicholas Elphinston's Instructions, January 19, 1569-70.

[2] Lesley's Negotiations, p. 84. Anderson, vol. iii. Also, Dépêches De la Motte Fenelon, vol. ii. pp. 389, 390.

[3] The forfeited property.

[4] MS., Calderwood, Ayscough, 4735, pp. 746, 747.

cloth on the opposite wall; and, having barricaded the door in the front, he had a swift horse ready saddled in the stable at the back. Even here his preparations did not stop, for, observing that the gate in the wall which enclosed the garden was too low to admit a man on horseback, he removed the lintel stone, and returning to his chamber, cut in the wooden panel, immediately below the lattice window where he watched, a hole just sufficient to admit the barrel of his caliver.[1] Having taken these precautions, he loaded the piece with four bullets, and calmly awaited his victim.

The regent had received repeated warnings of his danger; and, on the morning of the murder, John Hume, an attached follower, implored him not to ride through the principal street, but pass round by the back of the town, promising to bring him to the very spot where they might seize the villain who lay in wait for him.[2] He agreed to take his advice; but the crowd of the common people was so great, that it became impossible for him to alter his course. The same cause compelled him to ride at a slow pace, so that the assassin had time to take a deliberate aim; and as he passed the fatal house, he shot him right through the lower part of the body: the bullet entering above the belt of his doublet, came out near the hipbone, and killed the horse of Arthur Douglas, who rode close beside him.[3] The very suddenness and success of this atrocious action produced a horror and confusion which favoured the murderer's escape; and, mounting his horse, with the weapon of his revenge still warm in his grasp, he was already many miles from the spot; whilst the people, infuriated at the sight of their bleeding governor, were in vain attempting to break open the door of the lodging from which the shot proceeded. A few, however, caught a sight of him as he fled, and, giving chase, observed that he took the road to Hamilton.[4] Here he was received in triumph by the Archbishop of St Andrews, the Lord Arbroath, of whom Bothwellhaugh was a retainer, and the whole faction of the Hamiltons. They instantly assembled in arms, declared Scotland once more free from the thraldom of an ambitious tyrant, who had been cut off at the very moment when he was plotting against the life of his sovereign; and resolved instantly to proceed to Edinburgh, to join with Grange, liberate their chief the Duke of Chastelherault, and follow up the advantage they had won.[5]

All these events took place with a startling rapidity, of which the slow progress of written description can convey but a faint idea: in the meantime the unhappy regent, though bleeding profusely, had strength enough to walk to the palace, where at first the surgeons gave hopes of his recovery. Mortal symptoms, however, soon appeared, and when made acquainted with them, he received the information with his usual calm demeanour. When his friends bitterly lamented his fate, remarking that he might long since have taken the miscreant's life, and observing that his clemency had been his ruin, Moray mildly answered, that they would never make him repent of any good he had done in his life; and after faintly, but affectionately, commending the charge of the young prince to such of the nobility as were present, he died tranquilly a little before midnight.[6]

I will not attempt any laboured character of this extraordinary man, who, coming into the possession of almost uncontrolled power, as the leader of the reformed party, when he was little more than a youth, was cut off in the midst of his greatness be-

[1] History of King James the Sext, p. 46.
[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C. Hunsdon to Cecil, Berwick, 25th January 1569-70.
[3] Ibid., 24th January, 1569-70. Also, Ibid., 26th January 1569-70.
[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Copy endorsed by Hunsdon himself. Hunsdon to Elizabeth, Berwick, 30th January 1569-70.
[5] MS., State-paper Office, Information anent the Punishment of the Regent's Murder.
[6] Spottiswood, p. 233.

fore he was forty years old.[1] Living in those wretched times, when the country was torn by two parties which mortally hated each other, he has come down to us so disfigured by the prejudices of his contemporaries, that it is difficult to discern his true features. As to his personal intrepidity, his talents for state affairs, his military capacity, and the general purity of his private life, in a corrupt age and court, there can be no difference of opinion. It has been recorded of him, that he ordered himself and his family in such sort, that it did more resemble a church than a court;[2] and it is but fair to conclude that this proceeded from his deep feelings of religion, and a steady attachment to a reformation which he believed to be founded on the Word of God. But, on the other hand, there are some facts, especially such as occurred during the latter part of his career, which throw suspicion upon his motives, and weigh heavily against him. He consented to the murder of Riccio: to compass his own return to power, he unscrupulously leagued himself with men whom he knew to be the murderers of the king; used their evidence to convict his sovereign; and refused to turn against them till they began to threaten his power, and declined to act as the tools of his ambition. If we regard private faith and honour, how can we defend his betrayal of Norfolk, and his consent to deliver up Northumberland? If we look to love of country, a principle now, perhaps, too lightly esteemed, but inseparable from all true greatness, what are we to think of his last ignominious offers to Elizabeth? If we go higher still, and seek for that love which is the only test of religious truth, how difficult is it to think that it could have a place in his heart, whose last transaction went to aggravate the imprisonment, if not to recommend the death, of a miserable princess, his own sister and his sovereign.

All are agreed that he was a noble-looking personage, of grave and commanding manners. His funeral, which was a solemn spectacle, took place on the 14th of February, in the High Church of St Giles, at Edinburgh, where he was buried in St Anthony's aisle. The body had been taken from Linlithgow to Stirling, and thence was transported by water to Leith, and carried to the palace of Holyrood. In the public procession to the church it was accompanied by the magistrates and citizens of Edinburgh, who greatly lamented him. They were followed by the gentlemen of the country, and these by the nobility. The Earls of Morton, Mar, Glencairn, and Cassillis, with the Lords Glammis, Lindsay, Ochiltree, and Ruthven, carried the body; before it came the Lairds of Grange, and Colvil of Cleish; Grange bearing his banner, with the royal arms, and Cleish his coat armour. The servants of his household followed, making great lamentation, as Randolph, an eye-witness, wrote to Cecil. On entering the church the bier was placed before the pulpit, and Knox preached the sermon, taking for his text, "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord."[3]

[1] He was born in 1530, and slain in 1569-70.
[2] Spottiswood, p. 233.
[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, 22d Feb. 1569-70. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 158.

CHAPTER X.

INTERREGNUM—REGENCIES OF LENNOX AND MAR.

1570—1572.

THE death of Moray was a serious blow to Elizabeth. Its consequences threatened to unite closely the party which favoured the restoration of Mary, and were solicitous for a general pacification. The Hamiltons, Lethington, Herries, Huntly, and Argyle had vigorously resisted the measures of the regent, and felt impatient under the ascendancy of English influence, which Moray, Morton, and their faction had introduced. That "inestimable commodity,"[1] an English party in Scotland, which Elizabeth's ministers described as having been so difficult to attain, and so invaluable in its effects, was now threatened with destruction; and Lord Hunsdon, the very day after Moray's death, wrote in anxious terms, requiring the queen's immediate attention to the state of Scotland. Important matters, he said, depended, and would fall out by this event, and much vigilance would be required to watch "the great faction which remained, who were all French."[2]

Nor were these apprehensions exaggerated. If Elizabeth looked to her own realm, it was full of discontented subjects, and on the very eve of another rebellion. If to Scotland, Mary's adherents were in a state of high elatedness and hope;[3] the Hamiltons had already taken arms, the castles of Edinburgh and Dumbarton were in the hands of her friends, succours had arrived in the Clyde from France; and, on the morning after the regent's death, Scott of Buccleuch, and Ker of Fernyhirst, two of the mightiest of the Border chiefs, broke into England, and in a destructive "raid" let loose their vengeance. In their company was Nevil, the banished Earl of Westmoreland, a rough soldier and devoted friend of Mary, who, as Hunsdon wrote Cecil, had testified his joy on hearing of Moray's death by casting his hat into the fire—replacing it, no doubt, by a steel bonnet.

All this was ground for much anxiety at home, and the prospect was not more encouraging abroad. In France the news of Moray's assassination produced a paroxysm of joy, and was followed by active preparations to follow up the advantage.[4] In Spain no less interest was felt; and at that moment Douglas, a messenger from the Duke of Alva, employed by the Bishop of Ross, was in Scotland. He had brought letters to the friends of Mary, sewed under the buttons of his coat, had twice supplied them with money, and warmly exhorted them to keep up the contest until assistance arrived from Philip.[5]

These were all alarming indications, and the papers of Elizabeth's vigilant and indefatigable minister, Cecil, contain ample proof that he was not insensible to the importance of the crisis. In an able but somewhat Machiavelian memorial on the state of the realm, drawn up on the very eve of Moray's murder, and the argu-

[1] Anderson's Collections, vol. iv. part i. p. 104.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Hunsdon to Cecil, January 24, 1569-70.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Hunsdon to Cecil, Berwick, January 30, 1569-70. Also, Ibid., Information anent the Punishment of the Regent's Murder.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, French Correspondence, Norris to Cecil, February 17, 1569-70, Angiers. Ibid., Norris to Cecil, February 25, 1569-70.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Hunsdon to Cecil, January 26, 1569-70.

ments in which were greatly strengthened by that event,[1] he stated the perils both in respect of persons and matters to be many, great, and imminent; pointed out the increasing strength of the Romish party all over Europe; the decay and probable extinction of the Protestant power in France and Flanders; the weakening of all those counter forces which his mistress had hitherto been successful in raising against it; and the well-known resolution of the court of Rome, and the three great powers of Spain, Austria, and France, never to intermit their efforts until they had destroyed England, and placed its crown upon the head of the Scottish queen. In the same paper he called her attention to that unceasing encouragement to intrigue and rebellion which was held out by Mary's presence in England, and the growing unanimity and power of her party at home.

All this, it was evident, called for immediate exertion; and, in Cecil's opinion, there was but one way to provide a remedy, or at least to arrest the evil in its progress. Scotland was the field on which Elizabeth's domestic and foreign enemies were uniting against her. The strength of that country lay in the union of its various factions, which previous to Moray's death had been nearly accomplished by the efforts of Lethington and Grange, and which this event threatened to accelerate. Her policy, then, must be, to prevent a pacification, keep up an English party, and find her own peace in the dissensions and misery of her neighbour. For this end two instruments were necessary, and must instantly be procured: the first an ambassador, who, under the mask of a peacemaker, might sow the seeds of disquiet and confusion; the second, a regent, who would submit to her dictation. She found the one in Sir Thomas Randolph, an accomplished master in political intrigue, whom she despatched to Scotland only three days after the death of Moray.[2] For the second, she chose the Earl of Lennox, father of the unhappy Darnley, who had long been a pensioner upon her bounty, and whose moderate abilities and pliant disposition promised the subserviency which she wished.

Immediately after the regent's death, this nobleman had addressed a "supplication" to Elizabeth, representing the great danger in which it left the infant king, his grandson, her majesty's near kinsman, and suggesting the propriety of extending her protection to the "little innocent," by getting him delivered into her own hands.[3] This had been always a favourite project of the queen's, and disposed her to think favourably of Lennox; but another cause recommended him still more strongly: there had long existed a deadly hatred between the two great houses of Hamilton and Lennox, and no more effectual method to kindle a flame in Scotland could have been adopted, than the elevation of this nobleman to the first rank in the government.[4]

In the meantime Elizabeth received a letter from Lord Hunsdon, the governor of Berwick, which in some degree quieted her apprehensions, and gave her better hopes than he had at first held out. A week after the regent's murder, the Earl of Morton requested a meeting at Edinburgh with Sir Henry Gates and Sir William Drury, who had come to Scotland on a mission to the regent, and were in that country when he died. It was held in Gate's lodging; and there, besides Morton, the envoy met Grange, Lindsay, Sir James Balfour, Makgill the justice-clerk, Bellenden the clerk-register, with the lairds of Pitarrow and Tullibardine.

The conference was opened by Mak-

[1] Haynes, p. 579.

[2] MS. Letter, draft, State-paper Office, entirely in Cecil's hand. Minute of the Queen's majesty's letter, January 29, 1569-70. Melvil's Memoirs, p. 227; also 230, 231. "He," (Randolph) says the author, "was deliberately directed secretly to kindle a fire of discord between the twa stark factions in Scotland, quhilk could not be easily quenched."

[3] Haynes, p. 576.

[4] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 227.

gill, who assured the English envoys of their continued devotion to Elizabeth, and betrayed an evident terror lest she should set their queen at liberty and send her home amongst them. They spoke of an approaching convention of the nobility, but declared, that if the Queen of England would accept their services, secure their religion, and aid them to resist the intrusion of foreigners, they would run with her the same course which Moray had done, and decide on nothing till they knew her pleasure: as to a regent, her majesty would do well, they said, to think of the Earl of Lennox, a Stewart by birth, a Douglas by marriage, and at that time within her majesty's realm. If she would send him, they were ready to make him the head of their faction; and should she wish him to be accompanied by any confidential person whose advice he might use, they would gladly receive him also. In the concluding passage of Hunsdon's letter to the queen, he entreated her, when such "good stuff was offered," not to hesitate about its acceptance; adding, that if the Hamiltons were allowed to bear the chief sway, the French would not be long absent. Lastly, he implored her to watch the Bishop of Ross, and take good heed to the Scottish queen.[1]

Randolph soon after arrived in the capital, and notwithstanding the encouraging assurances of Morton and his friends, found things in an unsettled state.[2] Yet this was far from ungratifying to a minister who considered that the strength of his royal mistress lay in the dissensions of her neighbours. A messenger had been sent from Argyle and the Hamiltons, who warned their opponents not to acknowledge any other authority than the queen's; declaring that, as her lieutenants in Scotland,[3] they were ready to punish the regent's murder, but ridiculing the idea that the whole race of Hamilton were guilty because the murderer bore their name. To this the reply was a public proclamation interdicting any one from holding communication with that faction, under the penalty of being esteemed accomplices in their crimes. Soon after, Lethington, who till now had remained in a nominal captivity in the castle, was summoned, at his own request, before the Privy-council, where he pleaded his innocence of the king's murder, complained of the grievous calumnies with which his name had been loaded, and professed his readiness to stand his trial, and reply to any who dared accuse him. This, as it was well known, no one was prepared to do; and the Council immediately pronounced him guiltless, reinstating him in his accustomed place and office, "as a profitable member of the commonwealth," and one who had been an excellent instrument in the "forth-setting of God's glory."[4] Of his accession to the murder there is not the slightest doubt, and as little of Morton's guilt, who on this occasion took the lead as chancellor of the kingdom. The whole transaction was an idle farce, and deceived no one; but the party required Lethington's able head, and imagined they could thus secure his assistance.

At this meeting Randolph communicated his instructions, and assured the Council of his royal mistress's support, on condition that they would remain true to the principles of the late regent. For her part, he said, she would increase the rigour of Mary's confinement, and support them both with money and soldiers; from them she expected that they would watch over the young king, prevent his being carried to France, maintain religion, preserve peace, and deliver up the rebel Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland.[5] A convention of the

[1] MS. Letter, a copy by Hunsdon himself. State-paper Office, 30th Jan. 1569-70. Hunsdon to Elizabeth.

[2] He arrived on the 9th February 1569-70.

[3] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 157. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Edinburgh, 22d February, 1569-70, Randolph to Cecil. Also MS., State-paper Office, copy, Proclamation by the Lords of the Secret Council, Feb. 1569-70.

[4] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 158, MS., State-paper Office, copy, endorsed by Randolph, "Declaration of the Lord of Liddington's innocence of the king's murder."

[5] MS. Draft, State-paper Office, in Cecil's hand. Minute of the Queen's majesty's In-

whole nobility of the realm was summoned for the 4th of March, to take these offers into consideration, and proceed to the election of a regent.[1] Letters were written to Lennox, requesting his immediate presence; and Randolph, with an evident alacrity, recommenced his intrigues with all parties.

In the midst of this, a new rebellion broke out in the north of England. It was led by Leonard Dacres, a Roman Catholic gentleman, of noble family,[2] bred up in the bosom of Border war, who had been associated in the enterprises of Westmoreland and Northumberland, but was kept back by his friends at that time from any open demonstration. When still brooding over his projects, the law adjudged the rich family estates, of which he deemed himself the heir, to the daughters of his elder brother: and, stung with this imagined injury, he at once broke into rebellion, seized the castles of Naworth, Greystock, and other places of strength, collected three thousand men, and bid defiance to the Government. It was an alarming outbreak, and greatly disturbed Elizabeth; but the flame was extinguished almost as soon as kindled, for Lord Hunsdon instantly advanced from Berwick with the best soldiers of his garrison there, and Sir John Forster, warden of the middle marches, meeting him with the Border militia, they encountered the fierce insurgent on the bank of the little river Gelt, in Cumberland, and after a sanguinary battle entirely defeated him. Dacres and his brother fled into Scotland, where his presence, along with Westmoreland and Northumberland, formed a just subject of complaint and jealousy to the English queen.[3]

Scotland in the meantime presented a melancholy spectacle: torn between two factions—one professing allegiance to the captive queen, the other supporting the king's authority; both pretending an equal desire for the peace of their country, but thwarted in every effort to accomplish it by their own ambition and the intrigues of England. Of these two parties, the friends of the captive queen were the stronger, and must soon have triumphed over their opponents, but for the assistance given the latter by Elizabeth. They included the highest and most ancient nobility in the country: the Duke of Chastelherault and the whole power of the Hamiltons; the Earls of Argyle, Huntly, Athole, Errol, Crawford, and Marshal; Caithness, Cassillis, Sutherland, and Eglinton; the Lords Hume, Seaton, Ogilvy, Ross, Borthwick, Oliphant, Yester, and Fleming; Herries, Boyd, Somerville, Innermeith, Forbes, and Gray.[4] The mere enumeration of these names shews the power of that great party in the state which now anxiously desired the restoration of the queen, and resisted the hostile dictation, whilst they still entreated the good offices, of Elizabeth. They possessed the castles of Edinburgh and Dumbarton; the first commanding the capital of the country, the second its strongest fortress, and, from its situation on the Clyde, affording a port by which foreign succours could be easily introduced into Scotland. But their chief strength lay in Kirkaldy of Grange, and Maitland of Lethington the secretary; Grange being universally reputed the bravest and most fortunate soldier, and Maitland the ablest statesman in the country.

It was generally believed that, with two such heads to direct them, Mary's party would be more than a match for their opponents. Yet these were formidable enough. Their great leader, and the soul of every measure, was the Earl of Morton, a man bred up from his infancy in the midst of civil

structions given to Mr Randolph, 29th January 1569-70.

1 MS. State-paper Office, endorsed by Randolph, "Letters sent by the Lords for the Assembly, 17th February 1569-70."

2 Second son of Lord Dacres of Gillesland.

3 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Hunsdon to the Queen, 20th Feb. 1569-70. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, same to same, 27th February 1569-70. Lingard, vol. viii. p. 60.

4 MS., State-paper Office, Petition to Elizabeth, 16th April 1570. Endorsed by Cecil, "Duke of Chastelherault, and his Associates, to the Queen's majesty."

commotion, "nusselled in war and shedding of blood," (to use a strong phrase of Cecil's,[1]) and so intensely selfish and ambitious, that country, kindred, or religion, were readily trampled on in his struggle for power. His interest had made him a steady Protestant. By his professions of attachment to the Reformation, he gained the powerful support of Knox and the Church, and he was completely devoted to England. His associates were Lennox, Mar the governor of the infant king, Glencairn, and Buchan, with the Lords Glammis, Ruthven, Lindsay, Cathcart, Methven, Ochiltree, and Saltoun.[2]

Such was the state and strength of the two parties when Randolph returned to Scotland as ambassador from Elizabeth; and, acting under the directions of Cecil, exerted himself with such success to increase their mutual asperity, that every attempt at union or conciliation proved unsuccessful. The miserable condition of the country at this moment has been strikingly described by Sir James Melvil, an eye-witness, and an old acquaintance of Randolph. "Now," says he, "the two furious factions being framed in this manner, the hatred and rage against each other grew daily greater. For Master Randolph knew the diversities that were among the noblemen, and the nature of every one in particular, by his oft-coming and long residence in Scotland. Among the ladies he had a mother, and a mistress, to whom he caused his queen oft send communications and tokens. He used also his craft with the ministers,[3] and offered gold to divers of them. One of them that was very honest refused his gift, but he told that his companion took it as by way of charity. I am not certain if any of the rest took presents, but undoubtedly he offered to such as were in meetest rowmes,[4] to cry out against factions here and there, and kindle the fiercer fire, so that the parties were not content to fight and shed each other's blood, but would flyte[5] with injurious and blasphemous words, and at length fell to the down-casting of each other's houses, whereunto England lent their help. . . . Then, as Nero stood up upon a high part of Rome, to see the town burning which he had caused set on fire, so Master Randolph delighted to see such fire kindled in Scotland, and, by his writings to some in the court of England, glorified himself to have brought it to pass in such sort, that it should not be got easily slokenit[6] again; which, when it came to the knowledge of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, he wrote in[7] Scotland to my brother and me, and advertised us how we were handled, detesting both Master Cecil as director, and Master Randolph as executor."[8]

In such a state of things repeated attempts were made to hold that convention of the nobility which had been appointed to meet early in March; but all proved ineffectual; and Argyle, in a conference with Morton and Lethington at Dalkeith, bitterly reproached Randolph as the chief cause of their miseries. He appears to have taken the attack with great composure, and contented himself with writing a humorous satirical letter to Cecil, in which he amused the English secretary with a portrait of his Scottish brother. "The Lord of Lethington," said he, "is presently at Seton, to air himself before this convention. His wits are sharp enough, and his will good enough to do good, but fearful and doubtful to take matters in hand. He doubteth some thunderclap out of the south, (an allusion to Lennox's threatened coming,) for he hath spied a cloud somewhat afar off, which, if it fall in this country, wrecketh both him and all his family. . . . I doubt nothing so much of him as I do of the length of his life. He

[1] Haynes' State Papers, p. 581. The phrase is applied by Cecil to the Duke of Anjou.

[2] MS. Copy of the time, State-paper Office, Instructions given by the Lords of Scotland to the Commendator of Dunfermline, 1st May 1570.

[3] The Clergy.

[4] Offices.

[5] Scold.

[6] Extinguished with water.

[7] Into.

[8] Melvil's Memoirs, pp. 233, 234.

hath only his heart whole, and his stomach good, [with] an honest mind, somewhat more given to policy than to Mr Knox's preachings. His legs are clean gone, his body so weak that it sustaineth not itself, his inward parts so feeble that to endure to sneeze he cannot for annoying the whole body. To this the blessed joy of a young wife hath brought him."[1]

On the day this letter was written, the populace of Edinburgh, by whom the late regent had been much beloved, were highly excited by the display, in the open street, of a black banner, on which he was painted lying dead in his bed, with his wound open; beside him the late king under the tree, as he was found in the garden of the Kirk of Field; and at his feet the little prince kneeling and imploring God to avenge his cause. Many poems and ballads, describing Moray's assassination, and exhorting to revenge, were scattered amongst the people, and the exasperation of the two parties became daily more incurable.[2]

The failure of the great assembly appointed for March was followed by busy preparations. Every baron assembled his vassals; armed conventions of the king's and queen's lords, as the two rival factions were now termed, were held in various quarters; and Morton and Mar, who had been encouraged by the message from Elizabeth,[3] having assembled their friends in great strength in the capital, were eagerly pressing for the return of Lennox, when the arrival of Monsieur Verac from the court of France gave a sudden check to their hopes.[4] He brought letters of encouragement and ample promises of succour to Mary's friends; and, as they had received similar assurances from Spain, they concentrated their whole strength, advanced to Edinburgh, consulted with Grange the governor of the castle, restored the Duke of Chastelherault and Lord Herries to liberty,[5] compelled Randolph to fly from the scene of his intrigues to Berwick, and summoned a general convention of the whole nobility at Linlithgow. Its declared object was to return an answer to France, and deliberate upon the best means of restoring peace to their unhappy country; at the same time they addressed a petition to Elizabeth, in which they earnestly implored her to put an end to the miserable divisions of Scotland, by restoring the Scottish queen.[6]

Very different thoughts, however, from peace or restoration, were then agitating the English queen. The intrigues of Norfolk, the successive northern rebellions, the flight of the disaffected into Scotland, the invasion of Buccleuch and Fernyhirst, the fact that this "raid" had been especially cruel, and that its leaders had shewn a foreknowledge of Moray's death, besides the perpetual alarm in which she was kept by the dread of French intervention and Spanish intrigue, had roused her passion to so high a pitch, that she commanded Sussex,[7] her lieutenant in the north, to advance into Scotland at the head of seven thousand men. The pretext was, to seize her rebels; the real design was, to let loose her vengeance upon the friends of Mary, to destroy the country by fire and sword, and to incite the different factions to actual hostilities.[8]

On being informed of this resolution, the queen's lords exerted their utmost efforts to prevent the advance of a force which they were wholly unprepared to resist.[9] In England the Bishop of Ross and the French ambas-

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 1st March 1569-70.

[2] State-paper Office; printed Broadsides, in black letter, by Lekprevik.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Mar to the Queen of England, Edinburgh, 14th March 1569-70.

[4] Copy of the time, State-paper Office, Lethington to Leicester, 29th March 1570. Also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, John Gordon to Elizabeth, Berwick, 18th April 1570.

[5] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 167.

[6] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Duke of Chastelherault and his Associates to the Queen's majesty, written towards the end of March 1570, despatched from Edinburgh, 16th April.

[7] Supra, p. 294.

[8] MS. Letter, draft by Cecil, State-paper Office, the Queen to Mr Randolph, 18th March 1569-70. Melvil's Memoirs, p. 227.

[9] Copy of the time, endorsed by Cecil,

sador warmly remonstrated with the queen; Lethington, too, assured Leicester that a demonstration of hostilities would infallibly compel them to combine against her, and three several envoys successively sought the camp of Sussex to deprecate his advance. But Elizabeth was much excited; Randolph, at this moment, had warned her of a conspiracy against her life, and hinted that Mary was at the bottom of it,[1] whilst Morton blew the flame by accounts of the hostile activity of Lethington, the total desertion of Grange, and the warlike preparations of their opponents.

No one that knew the English queen expected that she would have the magnanimity or the humanity to arrest her arms. Under such provocation the storm burst with terrific force. Sussex, entering the beautiful district of Teviotdale and the Merse, the country of Buccleuch and Fernyhirst, destroyed at once fifty castles or houses of strength, and three hundred villages.[2] In a second inroad, Home castle, one of the strongest in the country, was invested and taken: about the same time the western Border was invaded by Lord Scrope, a country particularly obnoxious as the seat of Herries and Maxwell; and the track of the English army was marked by the flames of villages and granges, and the utter destruction of the labours of the husbandman.[3] To follow up this severity, Elizabeth despatched Lennox, her intended regent, and Sir William Drury, the Marshal of Berwick, at the head of twelve hundred foot and four hundred horse. This little army included the veteran companies, called the old bands of Berwick,[4] and had orders to advance to the capital, and avenge the death of the regent upon the house of Hamilton.

To Lennox no more grateful commission could be intrusted; and, making all allowance for the recollection of ancient injuries, it is difficult to regard the intensity of his vengeance without disgust. His letters addressed to Elizabeth and Cecil are unfavourable specimens of his character—full of abject expressions of implicit submission, unworthy of his country and his high rank.[5] He appears to have been wretchedly poor, entirely dependent for his supplies upon the bounty of the English queen; and although on his march a grievous sickness had brought him to the brink of the grave, his first thoughts on returning health were, as he boasted to Cecil, "that he should soon pull the feathers out of the wings of his opponents."[6] This he and his colleague, the Marshal of Berwick, performed very effectually; for having advanced to Edinburgh, and formed a junction with Morton and his friends, they dispersed the queen's faction, who were besieging the castle of Glasgow, and commenced a pitiless devastation of Clydesdale and Linlithgowshire, razing their castles, destroying their villages, and making a desert of the whole territory. In this expedition the palace of Hamilton, belonging to the Duke of Chastelherault, with his castles of Linlithgow and Kinneil, and the estates and houses of his kindred and partisans, were so completely sacked and cast down, that this noble and powerful house was reduced to the very brink of ruin.[7]

Having achieved this, Lennox wrote in an elated tone to Cecil, glorying in the flight of their enemies, recommending the English to reduce Dumbarton, and imploring Elizabeth to pity his poverty and send him more money.[8] From Lethington the Eng.

State-paper Office, Instructions for the Laird of Trabroun, 15th April, 1570. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 18th April 1570, John Gordon to the Queen's majesty.

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 14th April 1570. Randolph to Cecil.

[2] Murdin, p. 769. Lesley's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. iii. p. 90.

[3] Spottiswood, p. 237.

[4] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 176.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lennox to Cecil, 16th April 1570. Same to same, 27th April 1570. Same to same, 8th May 1570.

[6] Ibid., April 27, 1570. Ibid., 8th May 1570.

[7] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 177. Murdin, p. 769.

[8] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lennox to Cecil, 17th May 1570, Edinburgh. Ibid., The Lords to Sussex, 16th May 1570, Edinburgh.

lish minister received a letter in a different and more manly strain. It was his astonishment, he said, and a mystery to him, that the Queen of England had renounced the amity of a powerful party in Scotland, consisting of the best and noblest in the realm, for the friendship of a few utterly inferior to them in degree, and whose strength he might judge of by their being only able to muster two hundred horse. In their mad attempts they had thought nothing less than that they might have carried off the ball alone, and have haled the devil without impediment; but he had thrown a stumbling-block in their way, and although they would fain make him odious in England, he trusted Leicester and Cecil would give as little heed to their aspersions as he did to their threats. Meanwhile, he was still ready to unite with them in all good offices, and, whatever happened, would not be Lot's wife. As for Randolph, he feared he had been but an evil instrument, and would never believe the queen could have followed the course she now adopted, if truly informed of the state of Scotland.[1]

These remonstrances of Lethington were repeated and enforced in England by the French ambassador and the Bishop of Ross, and Elizabeth began to have misgivings that her severity would unite the whole country against her. She instantly wrote to Sussex, described her interview with the French ambassador, declared she had justified the expedition as well as she could, by asserting that she was only pursuing her rebels, but that she was sorry he had taken so decided a part, and would not hear of his besieging Dumbarton.[2] At the same time she commanded Randolph to return from Berwick to Edinburgh, and inform the two factions that, having "reasonably" chastised her rebels, she had yielded to the desire of Mary's ambassador, the Bishop of Ross, and was about to open a negotiation for her restoration to her dominions. In the meanwhile, Sussex was directed to correspond with Morton and his party. Ross repaired to Chatsworth, to deliberate with his royal mistress; and her offers for an accommodation were carried into Scotland by Lord Livingston and John Beaton. The English army then retired, and Elizabeth assured both factions of her earnest desire for the common tranquillity.[3]

These transactions occupied a month, and led to no pacific result—a matter of little surprise to those who were assured of the hollowness of the professions on the side of the English queen and Morton. The one had not the slightest intention of restoring Mary; the other deprecated such an event as absolute ruin; and, having humbled his enemies, looked forward to a rich harvest of forfeiture and plunder.

A correspondence between Sussex, the leader of the late cruel invasions, and Lethington, was the only remarkable feature in the negotiations. The English earl had been a commissioner in the conferences at York; he was familiar with the services of Moray, Lethington, and Morton, during their days of fellowship, and was selected by Elizabeth to remonstrate with Maitland on his desertion of his old friends. To his letters the secretary replied by some bitter remarks on his recent cruelties, and he exposed also the infamous conduct of the king's faction to their queen and their native country. Sussex answered, that he would be glad to know how Lethington reconciled his doings at York, when he came forward and accused his sovereign of murder, with his new zeal in her defence. "Your lordship," said he, addressing the Scottish secretary, "must call to remembrance that your queen was by you and others, then of the faction of Scotland, and not by the queen my sovereign, nor by her

[1] Copy, State-paper Office, Lethington to Cecil, 17th May 1570. I have ventured to state the letter from internal evidence to be addressed to Cecil. It is a copy, and does not bear any superscription.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Minute by Cecil of the Queen's Letter to Sussex, May 22, 1570.

[3] MS., State-paper Office, Draft by Cecil. Queen to the Lords of Scotland, May 31, 1570.

knowledge or assent, brought to captivity, deprived of her royal estate, to which she was by God's ordinance born lawful inheritrix, condemned in parliament, her son crowned as lawful king, the late Earl of Moray appointed by parliament to be regent, and revoked from beyond the seas; yourself held the place of secretary to that king and state; and after she escaped from her captivity, from the which the queen my sovereign had by all good means sought to deliver her, and had been the only means to save her life whilst she continued there, yourself and your faction at that time came into England, to detect her of a number of heinous crimes, by you objected against her; to offer your proofs, which to the uttermost you produced; to seek to have her delivered into your own hands, or to bind the queen's majesty to detain her in such sort, as she should never return into Scotland, and to persuade her majesty to maintain the king's authority. Now, my lord, to return to my former questions, which be but branches from those roots, and cannot be severed from them, I do desire to know by what doctrine you may think that cause to be then just, which you now think to be unjust? [how] you may think your coming into England, your detecting her of crimes by you objected, your proofs produced for that purpose, your requests delivered to the queen my sovereign to deliver her into your custody, or to promise to keep her as she return not to Scotland; and to maintain her son's authority, (then allowed always by you to be your lawful king,) —by what doctrine, I say, may ye think the causes hereof to be then just, which you now think to be unjust?

"I would be glad to admit your excuse, that you were not *of* the number that sought rigour to your queen, although you were *with* the number, if I could do it with a safe conscience. But as I will say, 'Non est meum accusare, aliud ago,' and therefore I will not enter into those particularities, so can I not make myself ignorant of what I saw openly delivered by word and writing, with a general assent of the late regent, and all that were in his company, which tended not to a short restraint of your queen's liberty, but was directly either to deliver her captive into your own custody, or to bind the queen my sovereign to detain her in such sort as she should never after trouble the state of Scotland: wherein, if her perpetual captivity or a worse matter were meant, and not a restraint for a time, God and your own consciences, and others that dealt then with you, do know. It may be you dealt openly on the one side and secretly on the other, wherein how the queen my sovereign digested your doings I know not; but this I know well, that if her majesty would have digested that which was openly delivered unto her by the general assent of your whole company, in such sort as you all desired, devised, and earnestly (I will not say passionately) persuaded her at that time to do for her own surety, the benefit of Scotland, and the continuing of the amity between both the realms, there had been worse done to your queen than either her majesty or any subject of England that I know, whomsoever you take to be least free from passions, could be induced to think meet to be done."[1]

This cutting personal appeal, from one so intimately acquainted with the secrets of these dark transactions, was evaded by Lethington, under the plea that if he went into an exculpation, it must needs "touch more than himself," glancing, probably, at his royal mistress; but Sussex in a former letter having assumed to himself some credit for revoking the army, the Scottish secretary observed, that they, no doubt, would need some repose after their exertions, and ironically complimented him for his activity in the pursuit of his mistress's rebels.

"When your lordship," said he, "writeth, that you intend to revoke her majesty's forces, I am glad thereof more than I was at their coming in; and it is not amiss for their ease

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, copy of the time, Sussex to Lethington, 29th July 1570.

to have a breathing time, and some rest between one exploit and another. This is the third journey they have made in Scotland since your lordship came to the Borders, and [you] have been so well occupied in every one of them, that it might well be said, . . , they have reasonable well acquitted themselves of the duty of old enemies, and have burnt and spoiled as much ground within Scotland as any army of England did in one year, these hundred years by-past, which may suffice for a two months' work, although you do no more."[1]

At the same time, Randolph, in a letter from Berwick to his old military friend Grange, bantered him on his acceptance of the priory of St Andrews—a rich gift, with which it was reported Mary had secured his services. "Brother William," said he, "it was indeed most wonderful unto me, when I heard that you should become a prior. That vocation agreeth not with anything that ever I knew in you, saving for your religious life led under the cardinal's hat, when we were both students in Paris."[2]

It would have been well if these little attacks and bickerings, which I have given as illustrating the character of some of the leading actors in the times, had been the only weapons resorted to during this pretended cessation of hostilities; but such was far from being the case. On the contrary, the country presented a miserable spectacle of intestine commotion and private war, and it was in vain that all good men sighed and struggled for the restoration of order and tranquillity; the king's authority was despised, the queen remained a captive, there was no regent to whom the poor could look for protection; every petty baron, even every private citizen, found himself compelled to follow a leader, and, under the cessation of agriculture and national industry, the nation was rapidly sinking into a state of pitiable weakness and bankruptcy. In the meantime, the Bishop of Ross and the Lord of Livingston continued their negotiations for Mary;[3] Cecil and the Privy-council deliberated, and the poor captive, languishing under her lengthened imprisonment, refused no concession which she deemed consistent with her honour; but every effort failed, from the exasperation of the two factions.

Morton and Lennox had despatched the Abbot of Dunfermline to carry their offers to Elizabeth, and were thrown into deep anxiety by her doubtful replies.[4] She had stimulated them to take arms, and now, as they had experienced on former occasions, she appeared ready to abandon them, when to advance without her aid was impossible, and to recede would be absolute ruin.

In this difficulty, a decided step was necessary, and they determined to raise Lennox to the regency. It was a measure imperatively required, as the only means of giving union and vigour to their party; and, as they acted with the advice of Randolph the English ambassador, they were well assured that, although Elizabeth affected neutrality for the moment, such a step would not be unacceptable to her. But in deference to her wishes for delay, they proceeded with caution. In a convention of the lords of the king's faction, held at Stirling on the 16th of June, they conferred upon Lennox the *interim* office of lieutenant-governor under the king, until the 12th of July. This choice they immediately imparted to the English queen, and earnestly entreated her advice as to the appointment of a regent.[5] Her reply was favourable:

[1] Copy of the time, State-paper Office, Ledington to Sussex, 2d June 1570, Dunkeld.

[2] Copy of the time, State-paper Office, May 1, 1570. Thomas Randolph to the Laird of Grange.

[3] MS., State-paper Office, B.C., Minute of the Queen's letter to Sussex, a draft by Cecil, July 29, 1570. Lesley's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. iii. p. 91.

[4] Copy of the time, State-paper Office, Instructions of the Lords of Scotland to the Abbot of Dunfermline, May 1, 1570. Also copy, State-paper Office, the Lords of Scotland to the Queen's majesty, June 1, 1570, Edinburgh, by the Abbot of Dunfermline. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lennox, Morton, and the Lords to the English Privy-council, 24th June 1570.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lennox,

the disorders of the country now called loudly, she said, for some settled government; and whilst she disclaimed all idea of dictation, and should be satisfied with their choice wherever it fell, it appeared to her that her cousin the Earl of Lennox, whom they had already nominated their lieutenant, was likely to be more careful of the safety of the young king than any other.[1] Thus encouraged, a convention was held at Edinburgh on the 12th of July, in which Lennox was formally elected regent. Lethington was then in Athole; Huntly, whom Mary had invested with the office of her lieutenant-governor,[2] remained at Aberdeen, concentrating the strength of the north; and the other lords who supported the queen's authority were busily employed arming their vassals in their various districts. Of course, none of these appeared at the convention; and Grange, who commanded in the castle, and might have battered to pieces the Tolbooth, where the election of the new governor took place, treated the whole proceedings with the utmost contempt. He refused to be present, would not even hear the letter of Elizabeth read by Randolph, and issued orders that no cannon should be fired after the proclamation.[3] Upon this, Sussex told Cecil that he had written "roundly" to him; but so little impression was made by his remonstrances, that the queen's lords declared their determination to hold a parliament at Linlithgow on the 4th of August, and publicly avowed their resolution never to acknowledge Lennox as regent.[4]

Both parties now prepared for war, and the new governor, aware that his only chance of success rested on the support of England, despatched Nicholas Elphinston to urge the immediate advance of Sussex with his army, and the absolute necessity of having supplies both of money and troops. Without a thousand footmen it would be impossible for him to make head, he said, against the enemy: Huntly was moving forward to Brechin with all his force; the Hamiltons were mustering in the west; Argyle and his Highlanders and Islemen were ready to break down on the Lowlands; and, at the moment he wrote, Lord Herries and the Lairds of Lochinvar, Buccleuch, Fernyhirst, and Johnston were up in arms, and had begun their havoc.[5] These representations alarmed Elizabeth. It was her policy that the two factions should exhaust each other, but that neither should be overwhelmed; and with this view she directed Sussex to ravage the west Borders "very secretly," and under the cloak of chastising her rebels the Dacres, who were harboured in these quarters.[6] At the same time that she thus herself kept up the war, she publicly upbraided both parties with the ceaseless rancour of their hostilities, and, with much apparent anxiety, encouraged Lord Livingston and the Bishop of Ross in negotiating a treaty for Mary's restoration.

But whilst nothing but professions of peace and benevolence were on her lips, Scotland was doomed to feel the consequences of such cruel and ungenerous policy in a civil war of unexampled exasperation and atrocity. To prevent any parliament being convened by the queen's lords at Linlith-

Morton, and the Lords to the Privy-council, June 24, 1570. The names shew the truth of Lethington's observations as to the weakness of the king's party, both in the ancient nobility and in numbers, in comparison with the queen's. They are—Earls Lennox, Morton, Mar, Glencairn, Angus; Lord Glammis, Lindsay, Ruthven, Ochiltree, Borthwick, Cathcart, and Graham the master of Montrose. Of the clergy, Robert (Pitcairn) abbot of Dunfermline, and Robert bishop of Caithness.

[1] Spottiswood, p. 241.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Sussex to Cecil, July 15, 1570, Alnwick.

[3] Copy of the time, State-paper Office, B.C., Sussex to Cecil, 19th July 1570, Alnwick.

[4] Copy of the time, State-paper Office, Instructions by Lennox to Nicholas Elphinston, July 23, 1570.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lennox to Randolph, Stirling, July 31, 1570. Ibid., Instructions to Nicholas Elphinston, July 23, 1570.

[6] Draft by Cecil, State-paper Office, July 26, 1570, Queen's majesty to Sussex.

gow, Lennox assembled his forces, with which he joined the Earl of Morton, and advancing against Huntly, stormed the castle of Brechin, and hung up thirty-four of the garrison (officers and soldiers) before his own house.[1] These exploits were communicated by Randolph to Sussex, now busy with his preparations for his expedition against the West, and he informed him at the same time that, in the negotiations then proceeding in England, the Scottish queen had, it was said, behaved with uncommon spirit. Elizabeth, before she restored her to liberty, having insisted on being put in possession of the castles of Edinburgh and Dumbarton, Mary, on the first mention of such conditions by the Bishop of Ross, indignantly declared that the matter needed not an instant's consideration. Elizabeth might do to her what she pleased, but never should it be said that she had brought into bondage that realm of which she was the natural princess.[2]

Sussex, at the head of four thousand men, now burst into Annandale, and advanced in his desolating progress to Dumfries. His own letter to the Queen of England, the mediatrix between the two countries, will best describe the nature of his visit. "I repaired," said he, "with part of your majesty's forces to Carlisle, and, receiving no such answer from the Lord Herries as I expected, ... I entered Scotland the 22d of this present, and returned thither the 28th, in which time I threw down the castles of Annand and Hoddom, belonging to the Lord Herries; the castles of Dumfries and Carleverock, belonging to the Lord Maxwell; the castles of Tynehill and Cowhill, belonging to the Lairds of Tynehill and Cowhill; the castles of Arthur Greame and Richies George Greame, ill neighbours to England and of Englishmen sworn, now Scots, and some other piles where the rebels have been maintained."[3] He observed, in a separate letter to Cecil, "That he had avoided as much as he might the burning of houses or corn, and the taking or spoiling of cattle or goods, to make the revenge appear to be for honour only;" and yet, he complacently adds, as if afraid lest his royal mistress should misunderstand his leniency, "I have not left a stone house to an ill neighbour within twenty miles of this town."[4] It is difficult to recount these transactions of Sussex, without expressing abhorrence of the cruel and nefarious policy by which they were dictated.

This invasion was followed by an abstinence of two months, during which the negotiations for Mary's restoration were continued; but, after repeated and protracted deliberations between the commissioners of Elizabeth, the Scottish queen, and the regent, the issue demonstrated the hollowness and insincerity of the whole transaction upon the part of the English queen, and the faction which she supported. Secretary Cecil and Sir Walter Mildmay had repaired to Mary at Chatsworth: they had proposed to her the conditions of an accommodation; and after taking the advice of her commissioners, and communicating with the King of France and the Duke of Alva,[5] whose answers she received, she had declared her acquiescence. All matters appeared to be upon the eve of a speedy arrangement, and it only remained for the English and Scottish commissioners to have a final discussion, when new demands, to which it was impossible for the Scottish queen to submit, were started by Elizabeth; and Morton for the first time declared that his instructions were limited to a general authority to treat of the amity of the kingdoms, and that he and his colleagues had no power to receive their queen into Scotland, or to give

[1] Copy of the time, State-paper Office, Randolph to Sussex, 14th August 1570.
[2] Ibid.
[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Carlisle, 29th Aug. 1570, Sussex to the Queen's Majesty.
[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Carlisle, Sussex to Cecil, 29th August 1570.
[5] Lesley's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. iii. pp. 109, 120, 121, 122, 123.

up to Elizabeth the person of their infant sovereign.[1]

This declaration Lesley, the bishop of Ross, with a pardonable warmth, characterised as an unworthy subterfuge, complained that his mistress had been deceived, and insisted that, if there was any sincerity upon the part of the English queen, the treaty for the restoration of the Queen of Scots might be terminated upon terms of perfect honour and safety.[2] But the appeal was addressed to ears determined to be shut against it. Morton's conduct appears to have been the result of a previous correspondence with Cecil and Sussex; he was well assured his declaration would be nowise unacceptable to Elizabeth herself: and the result justified his expectation. The English deputies, in giving a final judgment, observed, that as the representatives of Mary, and those of the king and the regent, could not come to an agreement, they considered their commission at an end, and must break off the negotiations.[3]

During all this time the regent, although professing to observe the truce, continued a cruel persecution of his opponents, and determined to assemble a parliament in which he might let loose upon them all the vengeance of feudal forfeiture. Against this Elizabeth remonstrated, but in such measured and feeble terms that her interference produced little effect.[4] It was not so, however, with Sussex, —a cruel soldier, but a man of honour, —who, on hearing a report that a sentence of treason was about to pass upon Lethington, wrote this sharp letter to Randolph:—

"Master Randolph,—I hear that Lethington is put to the horn, his lands and goods confiscated and seized; if it so be, it doth not accord with the good faith the queen's majesty meant in the articles accorded between her highness and the Bishop of Ross, nor with the writing I subscribed, and therefore I have written to the regent and others in that matter. . . . And although I, for my part, be too simple to be made a minister in princes' causes, yet truly I weigh mine own honour so much, as I will not be made a minister to subscribe to anything wherein my good faith and true meaning should be abused to my dishonour, or any person trusting to that he shall accord in writing with me, should thereby be by fraud deceived."[5]

At this moment nothing could exceed the exasperation of the two parties, who employed every method they could devise to blacken each other. The regent was branded by Huntly, the lieutenant for the queen, as a stranger and alien; a man sworn to the service of England, supported by foreign power, and dead to every honourable and patriotic feeling. Huntly and his friends, on the other hand, were attacked as traitors to the government, enemies to religion, band-breakers, assassins of the late virtuous and godly regent, and associates in that infamous band for the murder of their sovereign, which many had seen and well remembered. They replied, that if they were guilty or cognisant of the murder, their opponents were not less so, and produced the band itself, signed by Moray, the regent, amongst other names. It was answered, that this was not the *true* contract for the king's murder, which Lethington had purloined, and now produced another in its place. The disputes became public, and Randolph, who felt indignant at the attack upon his old friend the regent Moray, addressed a remarkable letter to Cecil in his defence. "Divers," said he, "since the death of the late regent, some to cover their own doings, (how wicked soever they have been,) some to advance their own cause, grounded upon never so much injustice and untruth, seek to make the late regent

[1] Lesley's Negotiations, Anderson, vol. iii. pp. 125, 127, 130, 131, 133.
[2] Ibid., pp. 134, 137, 139.
[3] Ibid., pp. 138, 139.
[4] Original draft in Cecil's hand, State-paper Office, 25th September 1570, Minute of the Queen's Majesty's letter to Sussex.
[5] Copy of the time, State-paper Office, 8th October 1570, Sussex to Randolph. Also Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 193.

odious to the world, spreading, after his death, such rumours of him as they think doth make most to their advantage towards their innocency in crimes that they are burdened with, and would fain be thought guiltless of; which is not only daily done here among themselves, but spread so far abroad as they think to find any man that will give credit either to their word or writing."

He then continued, "To name such as are yet here living, most notoriously known to have been chief consenters to the king's death, I mind not; only I will say, that the universal bruit cometh upon three or four persons, which subscribed into a 'band,' promising to concur and assist each other in doing the same. This band was kept in the castle, in a little coffer or desk, covered with green; and after the apprehension of the Scottish queen at Carberry Hill, was taken out of the place where it lay by the Laird of Liddington, in presence of Mr James Balfour, then clerk of the register, and keeper of the keys where the registers are. This being a thing so notoriously known, as well by Mr James Balfour's own report as the testimony of others that have seen the same, is utterly denied to be true, and another band produced, which they allege to be it, (containing no such matter, at the which, with divers other noblemen's hands, the regent's was also,) made a long time before the band of the king's murder was made: and now [they] say, that if it can be proved by any band that they consented unto the king's death, the late regent is as guilty as they; and for testimony thereof, as I am credibly informed [they] have sent a band to be seen in England, which is either some new band made among themselves, and the late regent's hand counterfeited at the same, (which in some other causes I know hath been done,) or the old band, at which his very own hand is, containing no such matter.

"Wherefore," continued Randolph to Cecil, "knowing so much of his innocency in so horrible a crime, besides the honour of so noble and worthy a personage, so dear a friend to the queen's majesty my sovereign, I am loath that, after his death, his adversaries should, by false report, abuse the honest and godly, especially her majesty, with such writings as they may either frame themselves, or with such reports as are altogether void of truth. With this I am bold myself to trouble your honour, and wish that the truth hereof were as well known to all other, as I am assured myself that he was never participant of the king's death, how maliciously soever he be burdened therewith."[1]

Amidst these mutual heartburnings and accusations, the party of the Church, still led by Knox, warmly espoused the cause of the regent and the interests of Elizabeth. He had bitterly deplored the loss of Moray, and, aware of Mary's application for succour to the courts of Spain and France, two powers connected, in his mind, with everything that was corrupt and idolatrous, he denounced her intrigues in the pulpit, and inveighed against her as a murderer and an adulteress, in his usual strain of passionate and personal invective. "It has been objected against me," said he, "that I have ceased to pray for my sovereign, and have used railing imprecations against her. Sovereign to me she is not, neither am I bound to pray for her in this place. My accusers, indeed, term her their sovereign, and themselves the nobility and subjects professing her obedience; but in this they confess themselves traitors, and so I am not bound to answer them. . . . As to the imprecations made against her, I have willingly confessed that I have desired, and in my heart desire, that God of His mercy, for the comfort of His poor flock within this realm, will oppose His power to her pride, and confound her and her flatterers and assisters in their impiety. I praise my God He of His mercy hath not disappointed me of my just prayer, let them call it imprecation or execra-

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Edinburgh, 15th October 1570, Randolph to Cecil.

tion, as pleases them. It has oftener than once stricken, and shall strike in despite of man, maintain and defend her whoso list. I am farther accused," he continued, "that I speak of their sovereign (mine she is not) as that she were reprobate, affirming that she cannot repent; whereto I answer that the accuser is a calumniator and a manifest liar, for he is never able to prove that, at any time, I have said that she could not repent; but I have said, and yet say, that pride and repentance abide not in one heart of any long continuance. What I have spoken against the adultery, against the murders, against the pride, and against the idolatry of that wicked woman, I spake not as one that entered into God's secret counsel; but being one, of God's great mercy, called to preach, according to His blessed will revealed in His Holy Word, I have oftener than once pronounced the threatenings of His law against such as have been of counsel, knowledge, assistance, or consent, that innocent blood should be shed. And this same thing I have pronounced against all and sundry that go about to maintain that wicked woman, and the band of those murderers, that they suffer not the death according to His Word, that the plague may be taken away from this land, which shall never be, so long as she and they remain unpunished, according to the sentence of God's law."[1]

To enter into the minute details of that miserable civil war, by which the country was daily ravaged, and the passions of the two rival factions wrought up to the highest pitch of exasperation, would be a sad and unprofitable task. Notwithstanding some assistance in arms and money from France and Spain,[2] and the incessant exertions of Grange and Lethington to keep up the spirit of the queen's friends, it was evident that they were becoming exhausted under the long-protracted struggle; and the capture of Dumbarton castle by the regent, which occurred at this time, gave a severe shock to their fortunes.

This exploit, for its extraordinary gallantry and success, deserves notice. The castle, as is well known, is strongly situated on a precipitous rock, which rises abruptly from the Clyde, at the confluence of the little river Leven with this noble estuary. It was commanded by Lord Fleming, who, from the beginning of the war, had kept it for the queen; and its importance was great, not only from its strength, which made many pronounce it impregnable, but because its situation on the Clyde rendered it at all times accessible to foreign ships, which brought supplies.

Captain Crawford of Jordanhill, to whom the attack was intrusted, had been long attached to the house of Lennox. He was the same person whose evidence was so important regarding the death of Darnley, and who afterwards accused Lethington of participation in the murder, since which time he appears to have followed the profession of arms. In the enterprise he was assisted by Cunningham, commonly called the Laird of Drumwhassel, one of the bravest and most skilful officers of his time; and he had been fortunate in securing the assistance of a man named Robertson, who, having once been warder in the castle, knew every step upon the rock familiarly, and for a bribe consented to betray it.

With this man, Crawford and his company marched from Glasgow after sunset. He had sent before him a few light horse, who prevented intelligence by stopping all passengers, and arrived about midnight at Dumbuck, within a mile of the castle, where he was joined by Drumwhassel and Captain Hume, with a hundred men. Here he explained to the soldiers the hazardous service on which they were to be employed, provided them with ropes and scaling ladders, and advancing with silence and celerity, reached the rock, the summit of which was fortunately involved in a heavy fog, whilst the bottom was clear. But on the first attempt all was likely to be

[1] Bannatyne's Journal, pp. 109-112, inclusive.

[2] Historie of James the Sext, pp. 62, 64.

lost. The ladders lost their hold whilst the soldiers were upon them; and had the garrison been on the alert the noise must inevitably have betrayed them. They listened, however, and all was still; again their ladders were fixed, and this time their steel hooks catching firmly in the crevices, they gained a small jutting-out ledge, where an ash-tree had struck its roots, which assisted them, as they fixed their ropes to its branches, and thus speedily towed up both the ladders and the rest of their companions.

They were still, however, far from their object. They had reached but the middle of the rock, day was breaking, and when for the second time they placed their ladders, an extraordinary impediment occurred. One of the soldiers in ascending was seized with a fit, in which he convulsively grasped the steps so firmly, that no one could either pass him or unloose his hold. But Crawford's presence of mind suggested a ready expedient; he tied him to the ladder, turned it, and easily ascended with the rest of his men. They were now at the bottom of the wall, where the footing was narrow and precarious; but, once more fixing their ladders in the copestone, Alexander Ramsey, Crawford's ensign, with two other soldiers, stole up, and though instantly discovered on the summit by the sentinel, who gave the alarm, leapt down and slew him, sustaining the attack of three of the guard till he was joined by Crawford and his soldiers. Their weight, and struggles to surmount it, now brought down the old wall and afforded an open breach, through which they rushed in, shouting, "A Darnley! a Darnley!" Crawford's watchword, given evidently from affection for his unfortunate master the late king. The garrison were panic-struck, and did not attempt resistance; Fleming the governor, from long familiarity with the place, managed to escape down the face of an almost perpendicular cleft or gully in the rock, and passing through a postern, which opened upon the Clyde, threw himself into a fishing-boat, and passed over to Argyleshire.[1]

In this exploit the assailants did not lose a man, and of the garrison only four soldiers were slain. In the castle were taken prisoners, Hamilton, the bishop of St Andrews, who was found with his mail shirt and steel cap on;[2] Verac, the French ambassador, Fleming of Boghall, and John Hall, an English gentleman, who had fled to Scotland after Dacre's rebellion. Lady Fleming, the wife of the governor, was also taken, and treated by the regent with great courtesy, permitted to go free, and to carry off with her her plate and furniture; but Hamilton, the primate, was instantly brought to trial for the murder of the king and the late regent, condemned, hanged, and quartered, without delay. Of his being not only cognisant, but deeply implicated in both conspiracies, there seems little doubt;[3] but the rapidity with which the legal proceedings were hurried over, and the feeling of personal vengeance which mingled with the solemn judgment of the law, caused many who were assured of his guilt to blame his death. The reformed clergy pointed to his fate as a judgment from Heaven; the people, who were aware of his corrupt life and profligate principles, rejoiced over it; and this distich was fixed to the gallows on which he suffered:—

"Cresce diu felix arbor, semperque vireto
Frondibus, qui nobis talia poma feras."

The loss of Dumbarton was a severe shock to the queen's cause. It gave a death-blow to all hopes of foreign aid; and the regent advanced to Edinburgh with the determination of holding a parliament, collecting his whole force, and at once putting an end to

[1] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 203. Buchanan, book xx. cap. 28 to 32. Historie of James the Sext, pp. 70, 71. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to the Privy-council, 3d April 1571. Also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to the Council, 9th April 1571.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to the Council, April 9, 1571.

[3] Copy of the time, State-paper Office, B.C., Lord Herries to Lord Scrope, 10th April 1571. Also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lennox, regent, to Burghley, 14th May 1571.

the struggle.[1] Grange, however, still held out the castle, keeping the citizens of the capital who favoured the king's faction in constant terror, and affording a rallying point to the queen's friends. During the late truce he had been guilty of many excesses; and on one occasion had broken the common prison, and rescued one of his soldiers who had stabbed a gentleman in the street. It was said, also, that he had carried off at the same time a woman, suspected of being cognisant of the late regent's murder. Upon hearing of the outrage, Cecil, his old friend, recently created Lord Burghley, remonstrated in indignant terms, expressing his horror that one in his high command, and who had in former years of their intimacy been a professor of the Gospel, should be guilty of so flagrant a contempt of its dictates. The concluding portion of his letter is remarkable:—"How you will allow my plainness," said he, "I know not; but surely I should think myself guilty of blood, if I should not thoroughly mislike you; and to this I must add, that I hear, but yet am loath to believe it, that your soldiers that broke the prison have not only taken out the murderer, your man, but a woman that was there detained as guilty of the lamentable death of the last good regent.

"Alas! my lord, may this be true? and with your help may it be conceived in thought that you,—you, I mean, that was so dear to the regent, should favour his murderers in this sort. Surely, my lord, if this be true, there is provided by God some notable work of His justice to be shewed upon you; and yet I trust you are not so void of God's grace: and so for mine old friendship with you, and for the avoiding of the notable slander of God's Word, I heartily wish it to be untrue. . . . I pray you commend me to my Lord of Ledington, of whom I have heard such things as I dare not believe of him, and yet his deeds make me afraid of his well-doing."[2]

This eloquent appeal of the English minister would have been well calculated to recall Grange to his duty, had he and Lethington not been aware that there were occasions when deeds of violence, and even assassination, did not excite, in his placid temper, such extreme feelings of abhorrence.

In the meantime, Morton, Makgill, and the Abbot of Dunfermline returned from their negotiations in England;[3] and, on rejoining the regent, it was determined to resume hostilities with vigour. Lennox issued a summons for the whole force of the realm to meet him at Linlithgow on the 19th of May, and Morton concentrated at Dalkeith the troops which were in regular service and pay.[4] Grange on his part was nothing intimidated. He had received money from Mary, who, although in captivity, contrived to keep up a secret intercourse with her supporters; about the same time a seasonable supply of a thousand crowns, with arms and ammunition, arrived from France.[5] The Duke of Chastelherault joined him with three hundred horse and one hundred hagbutters. Lord Herries and Lord Maxwell entered the capital with two hundred and forty horse; Fernyhirst soon followed them; and the castle was so strong in its garrison and its fortifications, that he regarded the motions of his opponents with little anxiety.

On the 9th of May, Lennox and Morton, having united their forces, encamped at Leith, and erected a small battery on a spot called the Dow Craig,[6] above the Trinity Church, with the object of commanding the Canongate, a principal street of the city. Here, whilst the cannon of the castle opened upon them, they assembled to hold their parliament, which was numerously attended, and fulminated

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Regent to Cecil, (now Lord Burghley,) Leith, 14th May 1571.

[2] Copy, State-paper Office, endorsed by Cecil himself, "Copy of my letter to the Laird of Grange, 10th January 1570-1."

[3] 19th April.

[4] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 209.

[5] Ibid., p. 211.

[6] The Pigeon's Rock.

a sentence of forfeiture against Lethington, his brother, Thomas Maitland, and others of the most obnoxious of their opponents. Having hurried through these proceedings, they broke up their assembly, and abandoned the siege, whilst Grange immediately held a rival parliament in the queen's name, and attacked his enemies with their own weapons.[1]

It is impossible to conceive a more miserable spectacle than that presented at this moment by the country and the capital: the country torn and desolated by the struggles of two exasperated factions, whose passions became every day more fierce and implacable, so that the very children fought under the name of king's and queen's men;[2] the capital in a state of siege; whilst the wretched citizens, placed between the fires of the castle and the camp of the regent, were compelled to intermit their peaceful labours, and either to serve under the queen's banner, or to join Lennox, and have their property confiscated. Two hundred chose this last severe alternative, and fled to the camp at Leith, upon which Grange passionately deposed the provost and magistrates, and placed Kerr of Fernyhirst, a fierce and powerful Border chief, in the civic chair, with a council of his retainers to act as bailies.[3]

Amid these transactions, Sir William Drury, the marshal of Berwick, had been sent by Elizabeth to open negotiations with the leaders of the two factions, and, if possible, to bring about a pacification. Such, at least, was the avowed object of his mission; but the court of England have been accused by Sir James Melvil of acting at this moment with great duplicity.[4] The various ministers whom they sent into Scotland, if we may believe this writer, a man of character, and intimately acquainted with the times and the actors, were instructed to widen rather than to heal the wounds of the country; and it is certain that Drury's conferences with Kirkaldy, Morton, and Lennox, were followed by fiercer struggles than before. Nor were English intrigue, and the jealous or selfish passions of the rival factions, the only causes of the continuance of this unhappy state of things: fanaticism added her horrors to the war; and the reformed clergy, by a refusal to pray for the queen, inflamed the resentment of her friends, and gave an example of rancour to the people. Knox, their great leader, had some time before declared his determination never to acknowledge her authority, and no longer to supplicate God for her welfare.[5] On the entry of his enemies, the Hamiltons, into the capital, he had been compelled to a precipitate retreat;[6] but his flight was followed by more resolute measures on the part of the Kirk and the clergy, an assembly being convoked some time after at Stirling, which confirmed his judgment and reiterated their refusal.[7]

Grange now determined to hold a parliament in Edinburgh, whilst the regent and the king's lords resolved to assemble the three estates in Stirling. On the queen's side, sentences of forfeiture and treason were pronounced against Lennox the regent, Morton, and Mar, the Lords Lindsay, Hay, Cathcart, Glammis, Ochiltree, Makgill, clerk-register, the Bishop of Orkney, and a long list of the king's faction, amounting nearly to two hundred persons.[8] The assembly, however, which was only attended by two of the spiritual and three of the higher temporal lords, was scarcely entitled to the name of a parliament.[9] On the other hand, their opponents, with a greater attendance of the nobility, and

[1] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 215. Historie of James the Sext, p. 87.
[2] Crawford, p. 179.
[3] Diurnal, p. 226.
[4] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 240. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Morton to Elizabeth, Leith, 23d August 1571.
[5] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 225. Historie of James the Sext, p. 93. Bannatyne's Journal, p. 98.
[6] Historie of James the Sext, p. 75. Bannatyne's Journal, p. 118.
[7] Historie of James the Sext, p. 80.
[8] Diurnal, pp. 236, 242, 243.
[9] Spottiswood, p. 256. MS., State-paper Office, August 1571. The speech of the king in the Tolbooth.

a more solemn state, met at Stirling. Here the young king, then an infant of five years, was invested in his royal robes, and carried from the palace to the parliament by his governor, the Earl of Mar, where he read a speech which had been prepared for him.[1] The doom of treason was then pronounced upon the Duke of Chastelherault, the Earl of Huntly, Sir William Kirkaldy of Grange, Lord Claud Hamilton, the Abbot of Arbroath, Sir James Balfour, Robert (afterwards Sir Robert) Melvil, and many others; whilst it was determined to despatch immediately an embassy to Elizabeth, for the purpose of concluding a more intimate alliance, and assuring her of their speedy triumph over the faction of the Scottish queen.[2] Before the parliament separated, a slight circumstance occurred which was much talked of at the time. The little king, in a pause of the proceedings, turning to his governor, asked him what house they were sitting in? On being answered, that it was called the parliament house, he looked up to the roof, and pointing to a small aperture which his quick eye had detected, observed, that there was a hole in that parliament. People smiled, but the superstitious declared that it augured disaster to the regent, whose death occurred only five days after,[3] in an enterprise which seemed likely at first to have brought the war on Grange's side to a fortunate and glorious conclusion.

This able soldier having learnt the insecurity with which the regent and his friends were quartered at Stirling, concluded that it would not be difficult, by a rapid night march, to surprise the city. Huntly, Lord Claud Hamilton, Buccleuch, Spens of Wormiston, one of the bravest and most successful captains who had been bred in these wars, Kerr of Fernyhirst, and two officers named Bell and Calder, were the leaders whom he selected. Their force consisted of sixty mounted hagbutters and three hundred and forty border horse; and as Bell had been born in Stirling, and knew every lane and alley, no better guide could have been chosen. This little force rode out of Edinburgh in the evening of the 3d of September, some horsemen having been previously sent to the ferry and other parts between Stirling and the capital, to arrest all passengers and prevent any information being carried there.[4] They first took the road towards Peebles, and it was reported in the enemy's camp at Leith, that they meditated an attack upon Jedburgh. Favoured by the night, however, they wheeled off in the direction of Stirling; and having left their horses about a mile from that city, entered it on foot by a secret passage in the gray of the morning, before the inhabitants were stirring. So complete was the surprise, that they occupied every street without difficulty;[5] broke up the noblemen's houses; and in an incredibly short time took prisoners the regent himself, the Earls of Morton, Glencairn, Argyle, Cassillis, Eglinton, Montrose, and Buchan, with the Lords Semple, Cathcart, and Ochiltree. These were placed under a guard in their houses, and at this moment, had the Borderers kept together, the victory was complete; but the Liddesdale men went to the spoil, emptied the stables of their horses, broke up the merchant' booths, encumbered themselves with booty, and dispersed in the lanes instead of watching the prisoners. It happened here, too, as is often the case in an action of this kind, that a few minutes are often invaluable. Morton, before he was taken, had blockaded his house, and refusing to surrender till it was set on fire, his resistance gave the townsmen time to recover themselves.

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, John Case to Drury, Stirling, August 29, 1571.

[2] MS., State-paper Office, August 1571. Persons forfeited in Scotland, Maitland, vol. ii. p. 1124. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 245.

[3] Historie of James the Sext, p. 88.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, from Scotland, a spy to Lord Burghley, 5th September, 1571. Also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Grange and Lethington to Sir William Drury, 6th September 1571.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Grange and Maitland to Drury, 6th September, 1571.

Mar, in the meantime, rushing from the castle with forty soldiers, commenced a fire from an unfinished lodging, which still fronts the High Street, and drove Huntly and Buccleuch, with their prisoners, from the market-place to another quarter, where they were assailed by the citizens on all sides; whilst Lennox, Morton, and the rest of the noblemen, so lately captives, snatched up such weapons as were at hand in the confusion, and soon put their enemies to flight.

In the midst of this confusion and struggle, Captain Calder, rendered furious by the disappointment, determined that the regent, at least, should not escape, and coming up behind, shot him through the back. Lennox had been made prisoner by Spens of Wormiston; and this brave and generous man, perceiving Calder's cruel intention, threw himself between them, and received the same shot in his body, and was then hacked to pieces by the soldiers, Lennox faintly imploring them to spare one who had risked his life in his defence. Calder afterwards confessed that he was instigated to this savage deed by Lord Claud Hamilton and Huntly, before they took the town, in revenge for the death of the Archbishop of St Andrews, whose ignominious execution the Hamiltons had sworn to visit to the uttermost upon the regent. A swift vengeance, however, overtook his assassin, for he and Bell, the chief leader of the enterprise, having fallen into the hands of the enemy, were instantly executed; Bell being hanged, having first been put to the torture, and Calder broke upon the wheel.[1]

Buccleuch was taken, only nine of the queen's party slain, and sixteen made prisoners. The loss would have been much greater, but that the Liddesdale and Teviotdale Borderers had stolen every hoof within the town, and not a horse could be found to give the chase. It was certainly, even with its half success, a daring exploit; and Grange, in a letter written a few days after, whilst he deplored the fate of the regent, could not refrain from some expressions of exultation. "In their parliament time, (saith he,) when all their lords, being twenty earls and lords, spiritual and temporal, were convened in their principal strength, wherein there were above two thousand men, three hundred of ours entered among them, were masters of the town, at least for the space of three hours, might have slain the whole noblemen if they had pleased, and retired themselves in the end with a rich booty, and without any harm."[2] The unfortunate regent was able to keep his seat on horseback till he entered the castle of Stirling, but the first view of his wound convinced every one that it was mortal; and his own feelings telling him he had but a few hours to live, he begged the chief nobles to come to his bedside. Here he recommended the young king, his grandson, to their affectionate care; reminded them, that as he had been faithful to his office, and had sealed his services with his blood, so he trusted they would fill his place by a man that feared God and loved his country. For his servants, they knew he had been cut off before he could reward them, so he must leave their recompense to his friends; for himself, he would only ask their prayers; and for my poor wife Meg, said he, turning to Mar and wringing his hand, you, my lord, must remember me lovingly to her, and do your best for her com-

[1] Second examination of Bell, State-paper Office, 6th September 1571. "George Bell . . being put to pains, declares he came running down the gate for Huntly and Claud, and cried, 'Shoot the regent! the traitor is coming upon us, and ye will not get him away.' Declared, also, that Claud inquired of his deponer, where is the regent? who answered again, he is down the gait, who gave commandment to him to follow, and gar slay him, and so past down and bad shoot him, as he else said. In the meantime, Warmestoun bad seek a horse to carry him away." There is also, in the State-paper Office, the examination of Captain Calder or Cadder, who confesses that he shot the regent; and before coming to Stirling, that he had received orders from Huntly and Lord Claud Hamilton to shoot both the regent and the Earl of Morton. MS., State-paper Office, 6th September 1571.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Burghley, Sept. 13, 1571.

fort.[1] He died that same evening, the 4th of September, and on the succeeding day, the Earl of Mar, governor to the young king, was chosen regent. His competitors for the office were Argyle, whom Morton had induced to join the king's faction, and Morton himself, who was supported by English influence; but the majority declared for Mar, whose character for honesty in these profligate times stood higher than that of any of the nobles.[2]

On his accession to the supreme power, Mar confidently hoped that, by a judicious mixture of vigour and conciliation, he should be able to reduce the opposite faction, and restore peace to the country;[3] but the difficulties he had to contend against were infinitely more complicated than he anticipated. On the one hand, Grange's position was strong, and his military resources far from being exhausted, as the regent himself soon experienced; for, after an attempt to bombard the city, first on the east side, and afterwards by a strong battery on the south, in a spot called the Pleasance, the name it still bears, he was silenced in both quarters, and forced to retire on Leith.[4] On the other hand, every attempt at negotiation was defeated by the unreasonable and overbearing conduct of Morton, who had entirely governed the late regent, and determined either to rule or to overwhelm his successor. This daring and crafty man, who was the slave of ambition, knew well that his best chance of securing the supreme power lay in keeping up the commotions of the country; and in this perfidious effort he received rather countenance than opposition from the Government of England. So successful were his efforts, that for some months after Mar's accession to the regency, and during the siege of the capital, the war assumed an aspect of unexampled ferocity.

In the midst of all this misery, the supporters of the captive queen were generally successful. Mar had been compelled to abandon the siege of Edinburgh, and now sent an earnest petition for assistance from Elizabeth.[5] In the north, Adam Gordon of Auchendown,[6] Huntly's brother, defeated the king's adherents in repeated actions, and brought the whole of the country under Mary's obedience.[7] Gordon's talents for war were of the first order, and in his character we find a singular mixture of knightly chivalry, with the ferocity of the Highland freebooter. Of the first, he exhibited a striking instance at Brechin, where, after a total defeat given to the Earl of Buchan, he generously dismissed nearly two hundred prisoners, most of them gentlemen, without ransom or exchange. Of his vengeance a dreadful example was given in his burning the castle of Towie, with its unfortunate mistress, the Lady Forbes, and her whole household, thirty-seven in number. In her husband's absence, she had undertaken its defence, and too rashly defied him from the battlements. Such a combination as that exhibited by Gordon was no unfrequent production in these dark and sanguinary times.[8]

Meanwhile, in England, was discovered a new intrigue of the Duke of Norfolk for his marriage with the Scottish queen. This nobleman had been liberated from the Tower, under

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Burghley, Berwick, Sept. 10, 1571. Spottiswood, p. 257.

[2] Ibid., September 14. Also, Spottiswood, p. 257. In a letter of Drury's to Burghley, MS., State-paper Office, B.C., September 5, 1571, he says, speaking of Lennox's reported death, "If it be true, the queen's majesty hath received a great loss, the like in affection she will never find of a Scottish man born person."

[3] Ibid., September 14, 1571. Drury gives Mar a high character, as "one of the best nature in Scotland, and wholly given to quietness and peace."

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Berwick, 9th October 1571, Drury to Burghley. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Hunsdon to Burghley, Berwick, November 4, 1571.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, endorsed by Cecil, Cunningham's demands, October 1, 1571.

[6] Auchendown castle in Banffshire.

[7] Historie of James the Sext, pp. 109-113, inclusive.

[8] Historie of James the Sext, pp. 97, 111. Crawford in his Memoirs, p. 213, attempts to defend Gordon from the exploit, because it was executed by one of his captains named Ker; but gives no proof that it was done without Gordon's orders.

the most solemn promises to forsake all intercourse with Mary; but his ambition overmastered both prudence and honour, and he had again embarked deeply with the Bishop of Ross and other friends of the captive princess in their schemes for her restoration and marriage. It was not to be expected that the English queen should again pardon so dangerous an attempt, and her animosity was roused to the highest pitch when she discovered the skill with which the plot had been carried on, its ramifications with her own Roman Catholic subjects, its favourable reception by the courts of France and Spain, and the undiminished spirit and enterprise of Mary. Norfolk was accordingly tried and executed, the Bishop of Ross sent to the Tower, and a determined resolution embraced, and openly declared by Elizabeth, that henceforth she would forsake all thoughts of the Scottish queen's restoration, and compel a universal obedience to the government of the king her son.

To obtain this, however, she was unwilling to incur the expense of an army, or the risk of a defeat. And by her orders, Sir William Drury, the marshal of Berwick, and Lord Hunsdon, the governor, began a correspondence with Grange, with the object of bringing him to terms. Lord Burghley, also, after a silence of two years, sent a friendly message to Lethington, and the secretary seemed rejoiced that their intercourse was renewed. He lamented their interrupted friendship, expressed satisfaction that some seeds of love yet remained, and trusted they would still produce either flower or fruit. To go into all the history of these sad times, he said, or of his conduct in them, would be as tedious as to declare, "*Bellum Trojanum ab Ovo;*" but this he would say, that since the beginning of their acquaintance he had reverenced him as a father, and followed his counsels as of the dearest friend he had. As to Drury's messages, the matters they had to treat of were such as related to honour, duty, and surety; no light subjects. They proposed, therefore, to send a special messenger to the queen's majesty, to inform her particularly of their intentions, and, in return, expected that she would grant a commission either to Drury or some other person, who should be empowered to conclude a treaty with them.[1]

This high tone appears to have disgusted Elizabeth: Drury's letters led to no satisfactory result; and Lord Hunsdon, after a tedious correspondence, was equally unsuccessful. He was instructed to bring over the queen's faction either by negotiation or by force; but when Grange discovered that he had no commission from his royal mistress to bind her by any positive agreement, he wisely rejected his offers; and as the force of which he talked did not appear to be forthcoming, totally disregarded his threats. There is, indeed, every reason to believe that Elizabeth's chief object at this moment in the negotiations with Mary's supporters was, to ascertain their exact strength, and the practicability of reducing the kingdom under the king's obedience.[2]

Meanwhile, owing to the season of the year, for winter was commencing, she determined to delay all hostilities, and permit the rival factions to exhaust each other, confident that her interest would not materially suffer by the delay. Nor were her hopes in this disappointed. For many miserable months Scotland presented a sight which might have drawn pity from the hardest heart: her sons engaged in a furious and constant butchery of each other;[3] every peaceful or useful art entirely at a stand; her agriculture, her commerce, and manufactures neglected; nothing heard, from one

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington to Burghley, castle of Edinburgh, 26th Oct. 1571.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Berwick, 10th November 1571, Hunsdon to the Lairds of Lethington and Grange; and, also, copy of the time, State-paper Office, Grange and Lethington to Hunsdon, Edinburgh castle, 9th December 1571.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph and Drury to Leicester and Burghley, Leith, February 23, 1571-2. Also Ibid., same to Hunsdon, Leith, February 26, 1571-2. Also MS. Letter, Randolph and Drury to Lord Hunsdon, Leith, 10th April 1572.

end of the country to the other, but the clangour of arms and the roar of artillery; nothing seen but villages in flames, towns beleaguered by armed men, women and children flying from the cottages where their fathers or husbands had been massacred, and even the pulpit and the altar surrounded by a steel-clad congregation, which listened tremblingly with their hands upon their weapons. Into all the separate facts which would support this dreadful picture I must not enter, nor would I willingly conduct my reader through the shambles of a civil war: prisoners were tortured or massacred in cold blood, or hung by forties and fifties at a time; countrymen driving their carts, or attempting to sell their stores in the city, were hanged or branded with a hot iron; women coming to market were seized and scourged; and as the punishment did not prevent repetition of the offence, one delinquent, who ventured to retail her country produce, was barbarously hanged in her own village near the city.[1] These are homely details, but they point to much intensity of national misery, and made so deep an impression, that the period, taking its name from Morton, was long after remembered as the days of the "Douglas wars."

When we consider the aggregate of human misery and guilt which such a state of things supposes, it is impossible to withhold our abhorrence at the cold-blooded policy which, for its own ends, could foster its continuance. Yet at this moment Elizabeth appears to have secured the services of Morton by a pension, and these services were wholly directed to oppose every effort made by the regent to restore peace to the country.[2] His principle was, never to sheath the sword till his enemies had unconditionally surrendered, and the cause of the captive queen should be rendered utterly hopeless.

Such a consummation, however, seemed still distant. The efforts of Gordon in the north, and Kirkaldy and Lethington in the capital, exhibited no signs of feebleness. Even the shocking severities I have mentioned of Morton produced little other feelings than execrations against their author; and before the middle of summer 1572 the affairs of the queen were once more in a prosperous condition. Gordon had completely triumphed in the north;[3] her supporters were masters of the principal city and the strongest fortress in the kingdom; they had been repeatedly supplied with money, arms, and ammunition, by France and Spain, and of the continued assistance of the latter, at least, had no reason to despair.[4] They had defeated Lord Semple in the west; their arms, under Fernyhirst, had carried all before them in the south; it was evident, from her long delays, that the Queen of England had some invincible repugnance to send any force to bombard the castle of Edinburgh; and if she did, they were in want of nothing for their defence; whilst their garrisons of Niddry, Livingston, and Blackness,[5] amply supplied them with provisions.

At this crisis, Elizabeth, who looked with alarm upon the increasing strength of her opponents, proposed a truce for two months, preparatory, as she said, to the conclusion of a general peace, on terms which should secure the honour and safety of the queen's supporters. The negotiations were managed by Sir William Drury and the French ambassador, De Croc, whose services, from the league recently entered into between France and England, were not so cordially given to the captive queen as on former occasions. It seems strange that so able a statesman as Lethington, and one so intimately acquainted with the

[1] The village of West Edmonston. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 296. Historie of James the Sext, p. 103.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Instruction by Morton, given to Sir William Drury to communicate to the Queen's Majesty. About 28th November 1571.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Lord Hunsdon, Restalrig, 9th July 1572.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Randolph and Drury to Lord Hunsdon, 26th February 1571-2. Also, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Mar to Burghley, April 30, 1572.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury and Randolph to Hunsdon, 17th April 1572.

duplicity of the English queen, should on this occasion have been prevailed upon to consent to a measure which ultimately proved the ruin of his mistress's cause.[1] But he and Grange had been branded by their opponents as men of blood, who had obstinately refused to give a breathing-time to their bleeding and exhausted country; and to confute the aspersion they agreed to the truce. It was signed on the 30th of July, and contained an express provision that, as soon as might be, the nobility and estates of the realm should assemble to deliberate upon a general peace. On the same day the truce was proclaimed in the capital, amid the shouts and joy of the inhabitants, and the now harmless thunder of the ordnance of the castle.

Having thus suffered themselves to be overreached by their crafty opponents, Kirkaldy and Lethington were not long allowed to be ignorant of their fatal blunder. Mar the regent was indeed sincere, but he was completely controlled by Morton. This ambitious man now ruled the council at his will: he successfully thwarted every effort to assemble the estates, or deliberate upon a general pacification; and, unfortunately for Scotland, a calamity occurred at this moment which struck all Europe with horror, and produced the most fatal effects upon any negotiations with which Mary and her supporters were connected.[2] This was the massacre of St Bartholomew, an event exhibiting, in dreadful reality, the result of Popish principles and intrigue; and which, though applauded in those dark times, is now happily regarded, alike by Romanists and Protestants, with unmingled feelings of execration and disgust. Five hundred Protestant gentlemen and men of rank, and about ten thousand of inferior condition, were butchered in cold blood; the greater part in the capital of France, where the king himself, it was reported, directed the assassins, looking from the windows of his palace upon the miserable victims who fled from their assailants.[3] In the provinces the same dreadful scenes were repeated; and when the news arrived in England, communicated by Walsingham, Elizabeth's ambassador at the court of Charles the Ninth, the suddenness of the shock electrified the whole country. Grief, pity, and indignation shook the national mind as if it had been that of one man. When Fenelon, the French ambassador, presented himself at the palace, he found the queen and the court clad in mourning. He was received in silence; the stillness of the grave, as he himself described it, seemed to reign in the apartments; the queen, indeed, endeavoured to preserve her equanimity, and although deeply sorrowful, received him without complaint; but the courtiers, fixing their eyes on the ground, refused to notice his greeting. Instead of a palace he seemed to have entered a chamber of death, where men were met to mourn for their dearest friends.[4]

But sorrow and indignation were not the only, or even the strongest feelings excited on this occasion in the breast of Elizabeth. She had, indeed, recently concluded a league with France; yet this, though it restrained the outward violence, did not diminish the intensity of her feelings. Fears for her own life, and terror for the result of those dark plots which she had already repeatedly detected and severely punished, perpetually haunted her imagination, and shook even her strong and masculine mind. Of these conspiracies Mary was the centre; she was engaged in a perpetual correspondence with the court of Rome; with France, whose name could not now be uttered without calling up images of horror; with Spain, where Philip and the Duke of Alva, men hated by the

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lethington and Grange to my Lord Ambassador of England, Edinburgh Castle, 13th July 1572. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Burghley, Resterwick, (Restalrig,) 18th July 1572. Ibid., copy of the time, 30th July 1572; Abstinence of hostility, signed by the Castilians.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Sir William Drury to Lord Burghley, 15th September 1572.

[3] Turner's Elizabeth, vol. iv. History of England, p. 322.

[4] Carte, vol. iii. p. 522. Lingard, vol. viii. pp. 113, 114.

Protestants, had recently lent her the most effectual assistance; and, what was more alarming to Elizabeth than all, the recent trial of Norfolk, and the confessions of the Bishop of Ross, now a prisoner in the Tower, had convinced her that as long as the Scottish queen remained in England the minds of her Roman Catholic subjects would be kept in perpetual agitation; that no permanent tranquillity could be reasonably expected; and that, judging by the recent excesses in France, her own life might not be secure.

It is impossible to blame such feelings or such conclusions. They were natural and inevitable: yet here let it not be forgotten that the terrors of the English queen are to be traced to an act of flagrant injustice. She had seized and imprisoned Mary contrary to every principle of the law of nations, to the promises she had given, to the commonest feelings of humanity: and her present thorny anxieties for her life and crown were a just retribution for such conduct. Making, however, every allowance for the fears of her council and her people, and the attachment of her great minister, Burghley, we are scarcely prepared for the calmness with which the death of the Scottish queen was recommended by the House of Commons, and strongly urged by Cecil. Elizabeth, however, would not listen to their arguments, and at last peremptorily put an end to their consultations.[1] She had already publicly declared that there had been no sufficient evidence exhibited against Mary by those who accused her of the death of her husband; and to bring her to trial in England, or to cause her to be publicly put to death without trial, would, she felt, be equally unjust and odious. She accordingly contented herself, after the death of Norfolk, with sending Lord De la Ware, Sir R. Sadler, and Bromley, her solicitor-general, to interrogate the Scottish queen regarding her political connexion with that unfortunate man, and to remonstrate against any continuation of her intrigues.[2] On this occasion Mary, although plunged in grief for the recent execution of the duke, was roused by the harshness of the messengers to a spirited vindication of her rights as a free princess. Some of the allegations she admitted, some she palliated, others she peremptorily denied; and the interview led, and was probably intended to lead, to no definite result.

But if Elizabeth abandoned all thoughts of bringing her royal prisoner to a public trial, and putting her to death in England, it was only to embrace a more dark and secret expedient, and what she judged a surer mode of getting rid of her hated and dangerous prisoner. The plot was an extraordinary one, and its details, upon which I now enter, are new to this part of our history.

Previous to the massacre of St Bartholomew, and after the failure of the negotiations for peace in Scotland, which were conducted by the French ambassador De Croc, and Sir William Drury, Elizabeth had resolved to send a new envoy to that country, with the object of watching over the English interests. When the dreadful news arrived from France, Burghley and Leicester pressed upon the English queen the necessity of instant attention to her safety on the side of Scotland, and Mr Henry Killigrew was selected to proceed thither.[3] He was instructed to negotiate both with Mar the regent and the opposite faction led by Lethington and Grange; to exhort both sides to observe the late

[1] The English bishops, in answer to a question of Burghley's, had given it as their opinion that Elizabeth might lawfully put Mary to death, and justified their sentence by reasons of Scripture taken from the Old Testament. See British Museum, Caligula, C. ii. fol. 524, and D'Ewes's Journal, p. 507. Also, Lingard, vol. viii. pp. 106-108

[2] Camden, p. 442. MS., State-paper Office, papers of Mary queen of Scots. The Lord De la Ware's and the rest of the commissioners' proceedings with the Scottish queen, June 11, 1572. Also, MS. draft by Cecil, State-paper Office, minute to the Scottish queen by the Lord De la Ware, &c.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, copy, August 1572. Instructions to Henry Killigrew touching the troubles in Scotland, being sent thither after the great murder that was in France.

truce; to give them the details of the late horrible massacre, expressing the queen's conviction that it was premeditated; and to implore them to be on their guard.

Such was his public mission; but shortly before he set out, Killigrew was informed that a far greater matter was to be intrusted to his management, that it was to be conducted with the utmost secrecy, and was known to none but Elizabeth, Leicester, and Burghley.[1] In an interview with the queen herself, to which none were admitted but these two lords, he received his instructions, which remain drawn up by Cecil in his own hand.[2] It was explained to him that it had at last become absolutely necessary to execute the Scottish queen, and that, unless the realm were delivered of her, the life of Elizabeth was no longer safe. This might, indeed, be done in England, but for some good respects it was thought better that she should be sent to Scotland, and delivered to the regent and his party, "to proceed with her by way of justice."[3] To accomplish this must depend, it was said, upon his skilful management. He must frame matters so, that the offer must come from them, not from the English queen. This would probably not be difficult, for they had already many times before, under the former regents, made proposals of this nature. If such an offer were again made, he was now empowered to agree to it; but it must be upon the most solemn assurance that she should be put to death without fail, and that neither England nor Scotland should be endangered by her hereafter: for otherwise, it was added, to have her and to keep her would be of all other ways the most dangerous.[4] If, however, he could contrive it so that the regent or Morton should secretly apply to some of the lords of the English council to have her given up, now was the best time; only, it was repeated, it must be upon absolute surety that she should receive what she deserved, and that no further peril could ever possibly occur, either by her escape, or by setting her up again. To make certain of this, hostages must be required by him, and those of the highest rank—that is to say, children or near kinsfolk of the regent and the Earl of Morton. Last of all, he was solemnly reminded that the queen's name must not appear in the transaction; and Elizabeth herself, in dismissing him, bade him remember that none but Leicester, Burghley, and himself were privy to the great and delicate charge which was now laid upon him, adding a caution, that if it "came forth," or was ever known, he must answer for it. To this Killigrew replied, "that he would keep the secret as he would his life;" and immediately set out on his journey.[5]

On entering Scotland, his first visit was to Tantallon, Morton's castle, where that nobleman was confined by sickness; but the ambassador received from him the strongest assurances of devotedness to the young king his sovereign, and to Elizabeth, whose interest he believed to be the same. Knox had returned again to Edinburgh, and the recent news of the massacre in France was producing the strongest excitement. On repairing to Stirling to meet the regent, he passed through the capital, and encountered there his old friend Sir James Melvil, from whom he understood something of the state of the

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, November 23, 1572.

[2] Murdin, p. 224.

[3] Dr Robertson notices the paper in Murdin, and severely condemns this proposal of Elizabeth. This eminent writer interprets it as if the queen had desired the Scottish regent to bring Mary to a public trial, and, if condemnation followed, to execute her. It seems to me clear, however, that the words, "*proceed with her by way of justice*," when taken with the context, can bear but one meaning, the same meaning in which Leicester employs the phrase, in his letter in the Proofs and Illustrations, No. XXIV.—that of executing her summarily and without delay. See Dr Lingard, vol. viii. p. 118.

[4] Murdin, p. 224.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, November 23, 1572.

Castilians,[1] as the queen's party were now called; and, in his subsequent interview with Mar, he found him expressing himself decidedly against any intimate alliance with France, and determined, so long as he had any hope of effectual assistance from England, never to connect himself with a foreign power. So far all was favourable; but it was evident to Killigrew that, without additional forces, which he well knew Elizabeth would be unwilling to send, the regent could never make himself master of the castle.

These, and similar particulars connected with his public mission, he communicated, as he had been previously instructed, to the Secretary of State; but his proceedings in the other great and secret matter touching Mary were contained in letters addressed to Cecil and Leicester jointly, and he appears to have lost no time in entering upon it. He informed them, in a despatch on the 19th of September, that he had already "dealt with a fit instrument, and expected that the regent and the Earl of Morton would soon break their minds unto him secretly."[2] The instrument thus selected to manage the secret and speedy execution of the unhappy Mary was Mr Nicholas Elphinston, a dependent of the late regent Moray, and who, from an expression of Killigrew's, appears to have been on a former occasion employed in a similar negotiation. Matters, however, were not expedited with that rapidity which Burghley deemed necessary; and this minister, although assured by his agent that he could not for his life make more speed than he had done, determined to urge him forward. For this purpose he addressed to him a letter, jointly from himself and Leicester. In reading it as it still exists, in the original draft in Cecil's hand, with its erasures and corrections, it is striking to remark the contrast between its cold and measured style and the cruel purpose which it advocates. It was written from Windsor, and ran thus:—

"After our hearty commendations, we two have received your several letters directed to us, whereof the last came this last night, being of the 24th of September, and as we like well the comfort you give us of the towardness in the special matter committed to you, so we do greatly long to receive from you a further motion with some earnestness, and that both moved to you and prosecuted by them of valour, as we may look for assurance to have it take effect; for when all other ways come in consideration, none appeareth more ready to be allowed here by the best, than that which you have in hand. Wherefore we earnestly require you to employ all your labours to procure that it may be both earnestly and speedily followed there, and yet also secretly, as the cause requireth: and when we think of the matter, as daily, yea, hourly, we have cause to do, we see not but the same reasons that may move us to desire that it take effect, ought also to move them, and in some part the more, considering both their private sureties, their common estate, and the continuance of the religion; all which three points are in more danger from [for] them to uphold than for us. The causes thereof we doubt not but you can enlarge to them, if you see that they do not sufficiently foresee them. We suspend all our actions only upon this, and therefore you can do no greater service than to use speed.

"Your loving friends,
"W. BURGHLEY."[3]

"From Windsor, the 29th of Sept. 1572."

In the interval between this letter and Killigrew's last despatch, the English envoy had not been idle. He had assured himself of Morton's cordial co-operation in the scheme for having Mary secretly executed; and, according to the instructions received from his own court, he had availed himself of the

[1] Castilians, so called from their having possession of the castle. MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, September 14, 1572.

[2] MS. Letter, British Museum, Caligula, C. iii. fol. 365, Killigrew to Burghley, September 19, 1572.

[3] MS. British Museum, Caligula, C. iii. fol. 394. This letter being a first draft by Cecil, is signed only by him.

deep and general horror occasioned by the late murders in France to excite animosity against the papists, and to convince all ranks that, without the most determined measures of defence, their lives and their religion would fall a sacrifice to the fury of their enemies.[1] He also had seen and consulted with Knox, who, although so feeble that he could scarce stand alone, was as entire in intellect and resolute in action as ever. The picture given of this extraordinary man by Killigrew, in a letter addressed to Cecil and Leicester, written on the 6th of October, in reply to theirs of the 29th of September, is very striking. "I trust," said he, "to "satisfy Morton; and as for John Knox, that thing, you may see by my despatch to Mr Secretary, is done, and doing daily; the people in general well bent to England, abhorring the fact in France, and fearing their tyranny. John Knox," he continued, "is now so feeble as scarce can he stand alone, or speak to be heard of any audience; yet doth he every Sunday cause himself to be carried to a place, where a certain number do hear him, and preacheth with the same vehemency and zeal that ever he did. He doth reverence your lordship much, and willed me once again to send you word that he thanked God he had obtained at His hands that the gospel of Jesus Christ is truly and simply preached through Scotland, which doth so comfort him as now he desireth to be out of this miserable life. He further said, that it was not of your lordship's [2] that he was not a great bishop in England; but the effect grown in Scotland, he being an instrument, doth much more satisfy him. He desired me to make his last commendations most humbly unto your lordship, and withal, that he prayed God to increase His strong spirit in you, saying, that there was never more need."[3]

It was, no doubt, by Knox's advice that proclamation was made, on the 3d of October, for a convention of the "professors of the true religion," to consult upon the dangers resulting from the conspiracies of the papists. To the sheet on which it was printed there were added certain heads or articles, said to be extracts from the secret contract between the pope, the emperor, and the kings of Spain and Portugal, for the extirpation of the Protestant faith;[4] and Killigrew believed that all these preliminaries would prepare the mind of the people for any extremities that might be used against their unhappy sovereign.

Meanwhile his tool, the Abbot of Dunfermline, was secretly trafficking with Morton and the regent, and so far succeeded, that on the 9th of October a conference on the proposed execution of Mary was held at Dalkeith, in Morton's bed-chamber, he being still confined by sickness. None were present but the regent Mar and Killigrew, who immediately communicated the result to Cecil and Leicester in the following letter:—

"My singular good lords,—What has past here since my last, touching the common cause, I have written to Mr Secretary at length.

"Now *for the great matter ye wot of*. At my being at Dalkeith with my lord regent's grace, the Earl of Morton and he had conference, and both willing to do the thing you most desire; howbeit, I could have no answer there, but that both thought it the only way and the best way to end all troubles, as it were, in both realms. They told me, notwithstanding, the matter was dangerous, and might come so to pass, as they should draw war upon their heads; and in that case, or rather to stop that peril, they would desire her majesty should enter in league defensive, comprehending therein the cause of religion also.

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Edinburgh, Sept. 29, 1572. Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester.

[2] The meaning is, I think, "that it was from no fault of your lordship's:" that is, of Burghley.

[3] MS. Letter, British Museum, Caligula, C. iii. fol. 370, October 6, Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester.

[4] Broadside, State-paper Office, entitled "Proclamation for a convention of the professors of the true religion," October 3, 1572; printed by Lekprevik, at St Andrews, A.D. 1572.

"We came," he continued, "to nearer terms—to wit, that her majesty should, for a certain time, pay the sum that her highness bestoweth for the keeping of her in England to the preservation of this crown, and take the protection of the young king. All this I heard; and said, if they thought it not profitable for them, and that, if they meant not to will me to write earnestly as their desire, I would not move my pen for the matter; whereat the Earl of Morton raised himself in his bed, and said, that both my lord regent and he did desire it, as a sovereign salve for all their sores; howbeit, it could not be done without some manner of ceremony, and a kind of process, whereunto the noblemen must be called after a secret manner, and the clergy likewise, which would ask some time. Also, that it would be requisite her majesty should send such a convoy with the party, that in case there were people would not like of it, they might be able to keep the field; adding, farther, that if they can bring the nobility to consent, as they hope they shall, they will not keep the prisoner three hours alive, after he come into the bounds of Scotland.[1] But I, leaving of these devices, desired to know, indeed, what they would have me write; and it was answered, that I should know farther of my lord regent's grace here. So as this morning, a little before dinner, going to take my leave of him, as he was going towards Stirling, he told me, touching that matter which was communed upon at Dalkeith, he found it very good, and the best remedy for all diseases, and willed me so to write unto your honours; nevertheless, that it was of great weight, and therefore he would advise him of the form and manner how it might best be brought to pass, and that known, he would confer more at length with me in the same. Thus took I my leave of him, and find him, indeed, more cold than Morton, and yet seemed glad and desirous to have it come to pass."[2]

Killigrew proceeded to say, in the same letter, that some were of opinion the queen could not be executed without the meeting of parliament, which might be called suddenly, and under pretence of some other business. The reason assigned was, that the Scottish queen had only been condemned as worthy of deposition on the ground of her accession to the murder of her husband; she had not yet been judged to die.[3] This proposition met with no encouragement from the English envoy; a clear proof that a secret and speedy death was the object desired by Elizabeth. The proposal was, as he hinted, an excuse to delay time, and to agree to it would have been to act contrary to his instructions. The conclusion of his letter I must give in his own words:—

"Although there be that do assure me that the regent hath, after a sort, moved this matter to nine of the best of their party—to wit, that it were fit to make a humble request to the queen's majesty, to have hither the cause of all their troubles and to do, *etc.*, who have consented to him, and that I am also borne in hand, that both he and the Earl of Morton do, by all dexterity, proceed in the furtherance thereof, yet can I not assure myself of anything, because I see them so inconstant, so divided. . . . I am also told, that the hostages have been talked of, and that they shall be delivered to our men upon the fields, and the matter despatched within four hours, so as they shall not need to tarry long in our hands; but I like not their manner of dealing, and therefore leave it to your wisdom to consider if you will have me continue to give ear, and advertise [if] I shall: if not, I pray your lordships let me be called hence."[4]

In this last sentence it is impossible not to see that the emphatic "to do,

[1] Sic in original.

[2] MS. Letter, Caligula, C. iii. fol. 373, 374, Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, 9th October 1572.

[3] MS. Letter, British Museum, Caligula, C. iii. fol. 374, 375, Killigrew to Lords Burghley and Leicester, October 9, 1572.

[4] MS. Letter, British Museum, Caligula, C. iii. fol. 375, Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, October 9, 1572.

et cetera"—the delivery of the Scottish hostages for the performance of the agreement upon the fields, and the "despatching the matter," that is, having the queen put to death, "within four hours," all shew that both the regent and Morton had given their full consent to the proposal. Measures were to be taken to have the sentence pronounced, (if, indeed, any ceremony of a sentence was seriously contemplated,) and the execution hurried over with the utmost expedition and economy: and the only cause of delay on the part of the regent and his brother earl was the selfish wish of making the most profit of this cruel bargain.

Four days after this, on the 13th of October, Killigrew sent another secret packet to Leicester and Burghley. He had again been at Dalkeith, and found not only Morton "very hot and earnestly bent in the matter," but "the two ministers" equally eager in the business. From the cautious manner in which the English envoy wrote, the names of these two ministers are suppressed, and in such a case conjecture is unsatisfactory. We know that Mr Nicholas Elphinston, and Pitcairn, the Abbot of Dunfermline, were the instruments already employed by Morton and Killigrew in this dark negotiation, and it is possible that they are here meant. Two other facts also are certain, from a letter of the English envoy: the one, that Cecil had enjoined him to avail himself of the co-operation of the Kirk in accomplishing the objects of his negotiation; the other, that he had already consulted John Knox, who, even in "extreme debility," and, as he describes it, "with one foot in the grave," was in mind as active as ever. From a letter already quoted, we have seen his convictions of Mary's guilt, and wishes for her execution; he may, therefore, have been one of the ministers to whom allusion is made. But this is speculation; and, after all, it might be argued that, from the words of Killigrew, the matter he spoke of to Knox was not the execution of Mary, as the former private interview may have solely related to the best method of exciting the people against France and the Catholic faction in Scotland.

However this may be, the English ambassador was informed by Morton that if Mar shewed coldness, or delayed to execute the matter, it should be done without him; and he added, that as he was lieutenant-general of the whole kingdom on this side Tay, he had power to carry it into execution.[1] He hinted, however, that if Elizabeth hoped to gain this great object, she must be more cordial in her support, and more generous in her advances. Her refusal to assist them, and her coldness, had already, he said, alienated some hearts, though not his. To this Killigrew shrewdly replied, that if Morton could at this moment have given some good assurance that Mary should be executed, or, as he expressed it in his dark language, for the performance "of *the great matter*," then he might safely reckon on the Queen of England for the satisfying his desires; but he must recollect that its accomplishment was the sole ground on which a defensive league between the two countries could be negotiated. Without it "a man could promise nothing."[2]

From the ambassador's next letter, however, any anticipated coldness or disinclination on the part of Mar appears to have entirely vanished. It was written from Stirling, and informed Burghley and Leicester that the regent, after some general observations on the subject of the peace, began to speak, "touching the great matter, wherein," said he, "I found him very earnest." "He had sent," he said, "his resolute mind to the Lord Morton by the abbot, and desired him (Killigrew) to write speedily to Burghley and Leicester, that they might further the same by all possible

[1] MS. Letter, British Museum, Caligula, C. iii. fol. 376, Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, 13th October 1572.

[2] MS. Letter, British Museum, Caligula, C. iii. fol. 376, Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, 13th October 1572.

means, as the only salve for the cure of the great sores of the commonwealth." "I perceive," added Killigrew, "that the regent's first coldness grew rather for want of skill how to compass so great a matter, than for lack of good-will to execute the same. He desired me also to write unto your honours to be suitors unto your majesty for some relief of money towards the payment of his soldiers."[1]

It is very striking that, in the midst of these dark practices, and when he had not only consented to Mary's death, but pressed that it should be speedy, Mar was himself struck with mortal sickness, and died at Stirling on the 28th of October, within ten days after his interview with the English ambassador.[2] Previous to this event, however, he and Morton had sent to Killigrew, by the Abbot of Dunfermline, the conditions on which they were ready to rid Elizabeth of her rival. They stipulated that the Queen of England should take the young king their sovereign under her protection; they demanded a declaration from the English parliament that his rights should not be prejudged by any sentence or process against his mother; they required that there should be a defensive league between England and Scotland; and that the Earls of Huntingdon, Bedford, or Essex, accompanied with two or three thousand of her majesty's men of war, should assist at the execution. These troops were afterwards to join the young king's forces in reducing the castle of Edinburgh. This fortress, when recovered from the enemy, was to be delivered to the regent, and all arrears then due to the Scottish forces were to be paid by England.

With these conditions Killigrew was grievously disappointed. He instantly, however, sent them by Captain Arrington, a confidential messenger, to Burghley, accompanied by a letter, in which he mentioned Mar's extreme danger, but gave some little hope of life. At the moment, however, when this was written at Edinburgh the regent had expired at Stirling, and Burghley received the account of his death, and the "Articles of agreement touching the great matter," almost at the same instant. Although commonly of a calm and collected temper, his agitation on the present occasion seems to have been extreme. The articles themselves were such as he had little expected —the price of blood demanded by the Scottish earls was unreasonably high; and he felt indignant at Killigrew that he should ever have received such proposals. But even if it had not been so, the death of Mar rendered it impossible to carry them into execution with the speed the necessity required; and he immediately wrote to Leicester, informing him of the total failure of their Scottish project, and emphatically remarking that the queen must now fall back upon her last resource for the safety of herself and her kingdom. What this was he shrunk from stating in express words, but he knew that Leicester could supply them; and there is not the slightest doubt that he alluded to the execution of Mary in England. His letter, however, is too characteristic to be omitted. It is wholly in his own hand.

"My Lord,—This bearer came to me an hour and-a-h[alf] after your departure. The letters which he brought me are here included. I now see the queen's majesty hath no surety but as she hath been counselled, for this way that was meant for dealing with Scotland is, you may see, neither now possible, nor was by their articles made reasonable. If her majesty will continue her delays for providing for her own surety by just means given to her by God, she and we all shall vainly call upon God when the calamity shall fall upon us. God send her majesty strength of spirit to preserve God's cause, her own life, and the lives of millions of good subjects, all which are most

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, 19th October 1572, Stirling.

[2] See Proofs and Illustrations, No. XXV. Letter of Killigrew on the death of Mar.

manifestly in danger, and that only by her delays: and so, consequently, she shall be the cause of the overthrow of a noble crown and realm, which shall be a prey to all that can invade it. God be merciful to us."[1]

Thus was Burghley and Leicester's project for Mary's secret execution by the hands of her own subjects destroyed by the death of Mar, at the moment he had consented to it; and the scheme which these cruel and unscrupulous politicians conceived themselves to have so deeply laid, on which they pondered, as Cecil owned, "daily and almost hourly," entirely discomfited and cast to the winds.

Mary in the meantime was herself unconscious of the danger she had escaped; and indeed it is worthy of observation, that so well had the English ambassador kept his counsel, and so true were the conspirators to their secret, that after a concealment of nearly three centuries, these dark intrigues, with all their ramifications, have now for the first time been made a portion of our national history.[2] Another base transaction stains the history of this year. During Morton's exile in England the Earl of Northumberland had been his kindest friend: Northumberland himself was now a captive in Scotland, under the charge of Morton; but, instead of a return of benefits, this base and avaricious man sold his unhappy prisoner to Elizabeth, who shortly after had him executed at York.[3]

CHAPTER XI.

REGENCY OF MORTON.

1572—1573.

The death of Mar, over which there hung some suspicion of poison, threw Killigrew, the English ambassador, into much perplexity;[4] and Burghley, who had received the news as early as the 3d of November, wrote on that day to Walsingham, the English ambassador at the French court, in much anxiety. "The 28th of the last," said he, "the good regent of Scotland is dead, as I think by a natural sickness, and yet the certainty is not known. This will make our causes the worse in Scotland, for I fear the conveyance away of the king; and yet there is care taken for his surety; but I can almost hope for no good, seeing our evils fall by heaps, and why the heaps

1 MS. Letter, British Museum, Caligula, C. iii. fol. 386, Burghley to Leicester, 3d November 1572.

2 MS. Letter, Caligula, B. viii. fol. 302, Killigrew to Leicester, begun 28th October, finished 31st October 1572.

3 Dr Robertson not having access to the State-paper Office, had not seen the letters of Killigrew and Burghley, which unveil this part of Mary's history. He consequently falls into the error of stating that Mar, from his honourable feelings, instantly rejected Killigrew's proposal of bringing Mary to her trial in Scotland, pronouncing her guilty, and executing her. All subsequent historians, amongst the rest the acute and learned Lingard, have been misled by this view of the transaction. Killigrew and Burghley's letters have at length given us the truth. No trial, it appears to me, was ever contemplated; although, to use Morton's words, "a kind of process" was to be used after a secret manner, (*supra*, p. 350;) and Mar, though at first cold in the matter, at last gave his full consent to Mary's being put to death as speedily and secretly as possible.

4 MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Hunsdon to Burghley, 1st May 1572. Ibid. Mar to Hunsdon, 23d May 1572. Also Ibid. Hunsdon to Burghley, 29th May 1572. Camden, p. 445. Gonzalez, p. 376.

fall not upon ourselves personally, I see no cause to the let thereof in ourselves. God be merciful to us."[1] . . .

Elizabeth, who felt the importance of the event, and dreaded the success of French money and intrigues in Scotland, lost not a moment in taking measures to preserve her party. She wrote to the Countess of Mar, recommending her to watch over the safety of the young prince, her dear relative, in whose welfare she took the deepest interest; and she sent a flattering letter to the Earl of Morton, in which, with unusual condescension, she addressed him as if already regent, calling him her well-beloved cousin, commending the wisdom with which he had governed himself in times past, in seasons of great difficulty, and expressing her hope that he and the nobility would take measures for the safety of the young king and the repose of the realm. For more particulars she referred him to Killigrew, her ambassador; and alluding to the necessity of appointing a new regent, trusted that the election would not disturb the quiet of the country.[2]

These were politic steps, as Morton was undoubtedly at this time the most able and powerful of the nobility. Even under Mar he had regulated every public measure; and when it was certain that the regent was on his death-bed, the whole administration of affairs seems naturally to have devolved on him.[3] He was supported by the great majority of the nobles, by the influential party of the Church, and by the friendship of England. Against such influence the Castilians and their friends could do little; and after a feeble opposition, he was chosen regent in a parliament held at Edinburgh on the 24th of November, and proclaimed next day with the usual solemnity.[4]

At this parliament Elizabeth's letters to the Scottish nobility were publicly read; and although these were not so decided in their language as her partisans had desired, there can be little doubt that the knowledge of her favour to Morton produced the greatest influence. On informing his royal mistress, and her minister Burghley, of the late events, Killigrew earnestly advised some more effectual assistance to be sent to the new regent. He had in vain endeavoured to induce the two factions to refer their controversies to Elizabeth. The Castilians were still confident in the strength of their fortress, and looked to speedy aid from France; Morton, on the other hand, although he admitted the desirableness of peace, had invariably asserted that to storm the castle and utterly subdue the king's enemies would be the only means to establish a firm government, and restore security alike to Scotland and England. But it was evident that this could not be done without some effectual assistance. The regent and the nobles were too poor to maintain any sufficient body of troops on their own resources, and the danger seemed to be, that if not supported by Elizabeth, they would look to France.

"This regent," said Killigrew, in his letter to Burghley, "is a shrewd fellow; and I fear little Douglas be not come home out of France without some offers to him among others; howbeit, hitherto, I can perceive nothing at all, for he assureth me still to run the course of England as much as ever regent did. Notwithstanding I see not how he can make war till the parliament be ended, though he had aid of money, and that for two reasons: the one, the parliament is appointed in this town, which cannot well be holden, because of the castle, if it were war, and the parliament must of necessity be holden for many weighty reasons; the other is the regent's indisposition, as he is not likely to travel for a month or two, but rather to keep his bed or chamber

[1] MS. Letter, Vespasian, F. vi. fol. 181 d. Burghley to Walsingham, 3d November 1572.

[2] Copy, State-paper Office, Elizabeth to Morton, 4th November 1572.

[3] MS. Letter, Caligula, B. viii. fol. 300, Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, 29th October 1572.

[4] Copy, State-paper Office, Killigrew to the Queen, 2d December 1572. See MS., State-paper Office, 19th Nov. 1572, Noblemen and others met at the convention in Edinburgh.

under the surgeon's care, for a disease that hath much troubled him this five or six years."[1]

A few days after the despatch of this letter, Killigrew made a rapid journey to Berwick to hold a conference with Sir William Drury on Scottish matters, and obtain his advice and assistance. He was recalled suddenly, however, to Edinburgh, by a report of Morton's extreme danger, but found him much recovered, and soon after had the satisfaction of receiving an assurance from England, that the queen had determined to give effective support to the new regent both in money and troops.[2] Of the money, part was instantly paid down; and, by Elizabeth's directions, two skilful engineers, Johnson and Fleming, repaired to Edinburgh and examined the strength of the castle. They reported that, with a proper force and battering trains, it might be taken in twenty days; and it was resolved, as soon as the season of the year permitted, to begin the siege.

It was in the midst of these transactions, and on the very day on which Morton was chosen regent, that the celebrated reformer Knox died, in his house at Edinburgh.[3] He was scarcely to be called an aged man, not having completed his sixty-seventh year; but his life had been an incessant scene of theological and political warfare, and his ardent and restless intellect had worn out a frame which at no period had been a strong one.

There is perhaps no juster test of a great man than the impression which he has left, or the changes he has wrought upon his age; and, under this view, none is more entitled to this appellation than Knox, who has been deservedly regarded as the father of the Reformation in Scotland. The history of his life is indeed little else than the history of this great religious revolution; and none can deny him the praise of courage, integrity, and indefatigable exertion in proclaiming that system of truth which he believed to be founded upon the Word of God. To this he was faithful to the last; and although it appears to me that on many occasions he acted upon the principle (so manifestly erroneous and antichristian) that the end justified the means, on no one occasion do we find him influenced by selfish or venal motives. In this respect he stands alone, and pre-eminent over all men with whom he laboured. To extirpate a system which in its every part he believed to be false and idolatrous, and to replace it by another of which he was as firmly persuaded that it was the work of God, seems to have been the master passion of his mind. In the accomplishment of this, none who has studied the history of the times, or his own writings, will deny that he was often fierce, unrelenting, and unscrupulous; but he was also disinterested, upright, and sincere. He neither feared nor flattered the great; the pomp of the mitre, or the revenues of the wealthiest diocese, had no attractions in his eyes; and there cannot be a doubt of his sincerity, when, in his last message to his old and long-tried friend, Lord Burghley, he assured him that he counted it higher honour to have been made the instrument that the gospel was simply and truly preached in his native country than to have been the highest prelate in England.

During his last illness his time was wholly occupied in offices of devotion, and in receiving the visits of a few religious friends, who affectionately assisted his family in the attendance which his feeble and helpless condition required. A few days before his death, he sent for Mr David Lindsay, Mr James Lawson, and the elders and deacons of the church,[4] and raising himself in his bed, addressed them in these solemn words:—"The time is approaching for which I have long

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Killigrew to Burghley, Dec. 10, 1572, Edinburgh.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Sir William Drury to Burghley, 21st December 1572. Great secrecy was to be used in the delivery of the money to Morton. The sum was £2500, to be defrayed in extraordinary causes. Original, State-paper Office, B.C., Sir Valentine Brown to Lord Burghley, 26th December 1572.

[3] Bannatyne's Memorials, p. 280.

[4] Bannatyne's Memorials, pp. 264, 283.

thirsted, wherein I shall be relieved of all cares, and be with my Saviour Christ for ever. And now God is my witness, whom I have served with my spirit in the gospel of His Son, that I have taught nothing but the true and solid doctrine of the gospel; and that the end I proposed in all my preaching was to instruct the ignorant, to confirm the weak, to comfort the consciences of those who were humbled under the sense of their sins; and bear down, with the threatenings of God's judgments, such as were proud and rebellious. I am not ignorant that many have blamed, and yet do blame, my too great rigour and severity; but God knows, that in my heart I never hated the persons of those against whom I thundered God's judgments. I did only hate their sins, and laboured at all my power to gain them to Christ. That I forbore none of whatsoever condition, I did it out of the fear of my God, who had placed me in the function of the ministry, and I knew would bring me to an account. Now, brethren, for yourselves, I have no more to say, but that you take heed to the flock over whom God hath placed you overseers, and whom He hath redeemed by the blood of His only-begotten Son. And you, Mr Lawson, [this was his successor,] fight a good fight. Do the work of the Lord with courage and with a willing mind; and God from above bless you and the church whereof you have the charge: against it, so long as it continueth in the doctrine of the truth, the gates of hell shall not prevail."[1]

During his illness he continued to exhibit all his wonted interest in public affairs, often bewailed the defection of Grange, one of his oldest friends, and sent a message to him, which at the time was regarded as almost prophetic. "Go," said he, addressing Lindsay, the minister of Leith, "to yonder man in the castle, whom you know I have loved so dearly, and tell him that I have sent you yet once more to warn him, in the name of God, to leave that evil cause. . . . Neither the craggy rock in which he miserably confides, nor the carnal prudence of that man [meaning the Secretary Lethington] whom he esteems a demi-god, nor the assistance of strangers, shall preserve him; but he shall be disgracefully dragged from his nest to punishment, and hung on a gallows against the face of the sun, unless he speedily amend his life and flee to the mercy of God."[2]

It appears to me that, in this and other similar predictions, the dying Reformer, who was not only intimately acquainted with, but personally engaged in, the secret correspondence between his party and England, availed himself of this knowledge to fulminate his threats and warnings, which he knew the advance of the English army was so soon likely to fulfil.

During this time his weakness rapidly increased, and on Friday the 21st of November he desired his coffin to be made. The succeeding Saturday and Sunday were spent by him almost uninterruptedly in meditation and prayer, in pious ejaculations, and earnest advices addressed to his family and friends. On Monday the 24th these sacred exercises were resumed till he was exhausted and fell into a slumber, from which he awoke to have the evening prayers read to him. "About eleven o'clock [I use the words of his excellent biographer] he gave a deep sigh, and said, 'Now, it is come;' upon which Richard Bannatyne, his faithful friend and secretary, drew near, and desired him to think of those comfortable promises of our Saviour Christ which he had so often declared to others; and perceiving that he was speechless, requested him to give them a sign that he heard them, and died in peace. Upon this he lifted up one of his hands, and sighing twice, expired without a struggle."[3] The Reformer was twice married. By his first wife, Mrs Marjory Bowes, he left two sons, Nathanael and Eleazer, who were educated

[1] Spottiswood, pp. 265, 266. Bannatyne's Memorials, p. 283.

[2] M'Crie's Life, by Crichton, pp. 300, 302. Melvil's Diary, p. 27.

[3] M'Crie's Life, by Crichton, p. 309. Bannatyne, p. 289.

in England, and both died without issue: it is remarkable that Eleazer entered the English Church. By his second marriage, with Margaret Stewart, the daughter of Lord Ochiltree, he left three daughters, Martha, Margaret, and Elizabeth, all of whom married, but the research of his able biographer has not detected any descendants.[1]

The death of Knox was followed by the complete recovery of Morton and the renewal of the war, after a vain attempt to prolong the truce.[2] But although hostilities recommenced, a parliament assembled in the capital, the house where it met being protected from the fire of the castle by a bulwark; and in this, after the election of the regent had been confirmed by the three estates, all measures adopted since the coronation of the young king were ratified, and every proceeding that had been conducted in the name of the captive queen declared invalid and treasonable. Measures, also, were taken to urge forward a reconciliation between the regent and such of the nobility as had not yet acceded to his government. Of these the greatest were the Duke of Chastelherault, the whole of the Hamiltons, Argyle, Huntly, and his gallant brother, Sir Adam Gordon, who still maintained his ascendency in the north. With a view to facilitate an accommodation, it was secretly resolved that for the present no inquiry into the murder of the late king should take place, nor any prosecution be instituted against such persons as were suspected of this crime. The regent was also empowered to pardon all persons accessary to the death of the Earl of Lennox.[3]

The object of all this was quite apparent. Morton himself, Huntly, Argyle, and Sir James Balfour, (who had lately deserted his friends in the castle,) were all of them concerned in the murder of Darnley; whilst the assassination of Lennox, the late regent, was as certainly the work of the Hamiltons. Any resolution to prosecute the perpetrators of either crime must have at once put an end to the hopes of a reconciliation, and it was determined for the present to say and do nothing upon either subject.[4]

During the first sitting of the parliament Killigrew was absent at Berwick, whither he had gone for the purpose of consulting with Sir William Drury and expediting the preparations for the approaching siege of the castle. Before his departure, however, he had a meeting with Nicholas Elphinston on the "great matter," or, to speak more plainly, the secret project for having Mary executed,—a subject which, although interrupted by Mar's decease, appears to have been resumed on the election of Morton. It seemed, however, that this dark design of Elizabeth, by which she hoped to rid herself of her enemy without her hand appearing in the transaction, was invariably destined to be thwarted. We have just seen that, for the security of Huntly, Argyle, and the regent himself, it had been resolved to accuse no person of the murder, and the same prudent considerations made it expedient, at this moment, to say and do nothing against the queen. In a letter addressed at this time by Elphinston to Killigrew, this is clearly explained. "The other matter," said he, "I doubt not, you know perfectly well, cannot nor may not at this time be touched, because presently the murder may not be spoken of, seeing some suspected thereof to be in terms of appointment, as I shall at meeting cause you more clearly to understand; but of this matter I trust hereafter shortly to see a good beginning."[5]

In this parliament a conference took place between the Kirk and certain commissioners appointed by the three estates, in which an important ecclesiastical measure was carried. This was the confirmation of that order for the election of bishops, which had

[1] Life of Knox, pp. 326, 327.
[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, January 1, 1572-3, Killigrew to Burghley.
[3] Supra, p. 341.
[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Jan. 26, 1572-3. Notes and titles of Acts as were passed in the parliament began at Edinburgh, Jan. 15, 1572.
[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, N. Elphinston to Killigrew, January 17, 1572-3.

been drawn up in the Book of Discipline, devised at Leith many years before. The change amounted to nothing less than the establishment of Episcopacy in the Scottish Church. It was decided that the title and office of archbishop and bishop should be continued as in the time which preceded the Reformation, and that a spiritual jurisdiction should be exercised by the bishops in their respective dioceses. It was determined that all abbots, priors, and other inferior prelates who were presented to benefices, should be tried by the bishop, or superintendent of the diocese, concerning their fitness to represent the Church in parliament, and that to such bishopries as were presently void, or which should become vacant, the king and regent should take care to recommend qualified persons, whose election should be made by the chapters of their cathedral churches. It was also ordered that all benefices with cure under prelacies should be disposed of to ministers, who should receive ordination from the bishop of the diocese, upon their taking an oath to recognise the authority of the king, and to pay canonical obedience to their ordinary.[1]

In the midst of these proceedings Killigrew returned to Edinburgh, and on the succeeding day was admitted to an audience of the parliament. The message which he delivered, and the assurances he conveyed of the determination of his royal mistress to protect the young king and support the government of the regent, produced an immediate effect; and a convention for a general pacification was soon after held at Perth, between commissioners appointed by the regent on the one side, and Huntly and the Lord of Arbroath, as the representative of the Duke of Chastelherault, on the other. It was attended by the English ambassador, in whose lodging the conferences took place, and who exerted himself so successfully to compose all subjects of difference, that at last a complete reconciliation was effected. "And now," said the successful diplomatist to Lord Burghley, "there remaineth but the castle to make the king universally obeyed, and this realm united, which, peradventure, may be done without force after the accord; notwithstanding, in my simple opinion, which I submit unto your honour's wisdom, it standeth with more reason and policy for her majesty to hasten the aid rather now than before this conference. I mean, so that it may be ready, if need require, to execute; otherwise not."[2]

At this moment the fortunes of the Castilians (so Grange and the queen's party were called) seemed reduced to the lowest ebb, and disaster after disaster threatened to bring total ruin upon their cause. Verac, who had been commissioned to bring them relief from the French king, was driven by a tempest into Scarborough, and detained in England. Sir James Kirkaldy, Grange's brother, who had landed at the castle of Blackness, with a large supply of money, arms, and military stores, was betrayed and seized; whilst the castle itself fell into the hands of the regent.[3] The example of Huntly and the Hamiltons, in acceding to the king's authority, was speedily followed by the submission of the Lords Gray, Oliphant, the Sheriff of Ayr, and the Lairds of Buccleuch and Johnston; whilst in the north Huntly undertook to bring over to terms his gallant

[1] Spottiswood, p. 260. Mr David Lindsay, a minister and commissioner, communicated these important measures to Killigrew in a letter written during the sitting of the conference, and when the guns of the castle were thundering in their ears. Its concluding sentence is worthy of notice, as it seems to shew that Killigrew had still in view such measures as he judged necessary for the prosecution of the "*great matter*" confided to him. "The article which your lordship desired me to remember, touching the murder, is not like to pass, lest it should hold back some that are willing to come to composition. I cannot tell how long the parliament shall last, but I suppose all will be ended this next Wednesday at the farthest. This day the castle has declared their ill-will with great shooting and little harm." . . . MS. Letter, State-paper Office, David Lindsay to Mr Killigrew, Leith, 16th January 1572-3.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 18th Feb. 1572, Killigrew to Burghley.

[3] Historie of James the Sext, p. 127. It was betrayed to the enemy by the treachery of the wife of Sir James Kirkaldy.

brother, Sir Adam Gordon, who, during the conferences at Perth, had surprised and routed the king's adherents at Aberdeen. With this view the indefatigable Killigrew had hurried from Perth to the capital, where he obtained the regent's signature to the articles of pacification.[1]

Even under all these gloomy appearances, the spirit of Grange was unbroken, and the resources of Lethington undiminished. A long experience of the parsimony of Elizabeth had persuaded them that she would never submit to the expense of sending an army and a battering train into Scotland. They looked with confidence to the arrival of assistance from France, and trusted that, even if long delayed, the strength of their walls would still bid defiance to the enemy.[2]

For a brief season these sanguine anticipations seemed to be realised; and the Queen of England, at the moment when Burghley imagined he had convinced her of the necessity of sending her forces into Scotland, began to waver. She dreaded bringing on a war with France; represented to her council the great expense and hazard of the siege; and asserted that Morton ought to be able to reduce it without her assistance. Killigrew was in despair. He wrote instantly, that if the expedition were abandoned, Scotland would be lost to them, and as surely united in a league with France. Everything, he contended, proved this. Lord Seton had been already negotiating with the regent to win him to France. What had been Verac's late commission? To corrupt the garrison of Dumbarton, to bribe the governors of the young king, and to convey him out of Scotland. What was Stephen Wilson's message out of France, when he was lately seized, and his letters to the captain of the castle of Edinburgh intercepted? Did he not bring assurances from the French king and the Bishop of Glasgow, Mary's ambassador in Paris; and had he not confessed the Pope's designs, and that of the rest of the Romish league, to be mainly directed against England and Scotland? Nay, were not the papal coffers already unlocked, and the man's name known who was shortly to bring the money, and begin the attack? And would her majesty shut her eyes to all this, and this too at the very crisis when a decided effort, and no very great sum, might enable her to confound these plans and secure her ground in Scotland? Would she countermand her army, and abandon the advantages which were within her reach, or rather which she had already secured? "If so," said the ambassador, in the end of an eloquent letter to Burghley, "God's will be done. For mine own part, if this castle be not recovered, and that with expedition, I see, methinks, the beginning of sorrows, and her majesty's peaceable reign hitherto, decaying as it were in post, which God of His mercy defend. The reasons be so apparent, as I need not to trouble your honour with them, whose shoulders, next her majesty's, shall not carry the least burthen, and therefore I pray God send you strength to overcome."[3]

These arguments produced the desired effect; Elizabeth's parsimonious fears gave way under the alarming arguments of her ambassador; and orders were despatched to Sir William Drury, who had been chosen to command the enterprise, to have everything in readiness for the march of the army and the transport of the cannon at a moment's notice. A last attempt to bring the Castilians to terms was now made by the Earl of Rothes; but it led to no result. Kirkaldy and Lethington declared that, though deserted by all their friends, they would keep the castle to the last; and on the 25th of April the English army, consisting of five hundred hagbutters, and a hundred and forty pikemen, entered the capital. They were

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Killigrew to Burghley, February 23, 1572-3. "God so blessed this treaty, as this day, being the 23d aforenoon, the Articles of Accord and Pacification were signed."

[2] Copy of the time, State-paper Office, 23d Feb. 1572-3. Lord Lethington and Grange to the Earl of Huntly.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 9th March, 1572-3, Killigrew to Burghley.

joined by seven hundred soldiers of the regent's; and the battering train having at the same time arrived by sea, the operations of the siege commenced.

In the midst of these martial transactions, the regent assembled a parliament, which confirmed the league with England, ratified the late pacification, restored Huntly and Sir James Balfour to their estates and honours, and pronounced a sentence of treason and forfeiture against the Castilians. A summons of surrender was then sent to Grange in the name of Morton and of the English general,[1] and operations for undermining the "Spur" or blockhouse, and erecting batteries on the principal spots which commanded the walls, proceeded with little interruption from the besieged. Their obstinacy, indeed, was surprising, and can only be accounted for by the extraordinary influence which Lethington possessed, and his fatal conviction that succours would yet arrive from France. His power over Kirkaldy was described by Killigrew as something like enchantment; and although Robert Melvil, Pitarrow, and other leading men, would fain have come to terms; though they argued that their powder and ammunition were exhausted, their victuals and supply of water on the point of failing, and their distress increasing every moment; still the governor declared he would hold the castle till he was buried in its ruins.

On the 2d of May, Killigrew, who himself assisted in the trenches, wrote thus to Burghley:—"Yesterday I did advertise your honour of the end of the parliament. This day, Sir Henry Ley, with his company, dined with the regent; and upon Monday, the 4th of this month, the general doth intend to begin to plant his batteries. They within make good show, and fortify continually to frustrate the first battery, although the regent and others here be of opinion that they will never abide the extremity. Their water will soon be taken from them when the ordnance shall be laid both within and without. Hope of succour there is none, and therefore their obstinacy must needs be vain. I send your lordship the roll of their names within, both tag and rag; and, as I am informed, eighteen of the best of them would fain be out."[2] All such hopes of escape, however, were now utterly vain, for Drury perceived his advantage, and Morton had determined to receive nothing but an unconditional surrender. In England the result of the siege was regarded with deep interest, and many young cavaliers, amongst whom was Thomas Cecil, Burghley's eldest son, repaired from the English court to join the army and work in the trenches.

On the 17th of May the batteries were completed, and, beginning to play upon the principal bastion, named David's Tower, were answered by a long and loud shriek from the women in the castle, which was distinctly heard in the English camp. "This day," (17th May,) said Killigrew in one of his journal letters to Burghley, "at one of the clock in the afternoon, some of our pieces began to speak such language as it made both them in the castle, I am sure, think more of God than they did before; and all our men, and a great many others, think the enterprise not so hard as before they took it to be. . . . I trust, to be short, that after the battery shall be outlaid, which, as they say, will be ready by the twenty-first of this month, the matter will be at a point before the end of the same. . . . Thanks be to God, although it be longsome, it hath hitherto been with the least blood that ever was heard in such a case; and this conjecture we have to lead us, that they want store of powder within, for they have suffered us to plant all the ordnance, and to shoot yesterday, all the afternoon, without any harm from them."[3] . . . .

[1] Copy, State-paper Office, April 25, 1573, Sir W. Drury's Summons. Also ibid., the Regent's Summons, MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Killigrew to Burghley, April 27, 1573. Also MS., ibid. Acts of the Parliament, 30th April 1573.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 2d May 1573, Killigrew to Burghley.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Edin-

From this time till the 23d the cannon played incessantly upon the castle, the guns of the garrison were silenced, and in the afternoon of that day the southern wall of David's Tower fell with a great crash; next day its east quarter, the portcullis and an outer bastion named Wallace Tower, were beaten down; and on the 26th the English, with little resistance, stormed the "Spur" or blockhouse.[1] Preparations were now made for a general assault; and Morton, who had determined to lead the Scottish forces, was exulting in the near prospect of laying hands upon his victims, when to his mortification Grange presented himself on the wall with a white rod in his hand, and obtained, from his old friend and fellow-soldier Drury, an abstinence of two days, preparatory to a surrender. This was in the evening, and a meeting immediately took place between Grange and Robert Melvil on the part of the Castilians, Killigrew and Drury for the Queen of England, and Lord Boyd for the regent. Kirkaldy's requests were, to have surety for their lives and livings, not to be spoiled of their goods within the castle, to have licence for Lord Hume and Lethington to retire into England, and himself to be allowed to remain unmolested in his own country.[2]

To these conditions Drury would probably have agreed, but they were scornfully rejected by Morton. As to the great body of the garrison, he said he was ready, if they came out singly without arms, and submitted to his mercy, to grant them their lives, and permit them to go where they pleased; but there were nine persons who must be excepted from these conditions: Grange himself, William Maitland of Lethington the secretary, Alexander Lord Hume, Robert Melvil of Murdocairny, the Bishop of Dunkeld, and the Lairds of Restalrig, Drylaw, and Pitarrow. These must submit themselves unconditionally, and their fate be determined by the Queen of England, according to the treaty already made between her majesty and his sovereign.[3]

This stern reply made it evident to these unfortunate men, that the regent would be contented with nothing but their lives; and, convinced of this, they rejected his terms, and declared their resolution to abide the worst. But this was no longer in their power, for the soldiers began to mutiny, threatened to hang the secretary over the walls within six hours if he did not advise a surrender, and were ready to deliver the captain and his companions to the enemy.[4] In this dread dilemma an expedient was adopted, suggested probably by the fertile brain of Lethington. Grange, after refusing the terms in open conference, sent a secret message to Drury, in consequence of which two companies of the besieging force were admitted within the walls on the night of the 29th, and to them in the morning he and his companions surrendered: expressly stating, that they submitted, not to the Regent of Scotland, but to the Queen of England, and her general, Sir William Drury. They were accordingly carried to his quarters; and, notwithstanding some remonstrances upon the part of the regent, received with courtesy.[5] Morton, however, was not thus to be balked of his prey. He instantly wrote to

burgh, Killigrew to Burghley, May 17, 1573. Also Drury to Burghley, May 18, 1573. "After the first tyre of ordnance great cries and shouts was made by the women of the castle, terming the day and hour black."

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Burghley, May 28, 1573.

[2] Ibid., Killigrew to Burghley, May 27, 1573. Also ibid., Sir William Drury to Burghley, May 28, 1572, in which Drury says, "I will not harken unto the request of the Castilians, further than the regent and our ambassador shall allow of."

[3] Copy of the time, State-paper Office, "The regent's answer to the Castilians," May 28, 1573. Also, State-paper Office, copy, "Conditions of rendering the castle."

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Killigrew to Burghley, June 20, 1573.

[5] Ibid., Sir William Drury to Burghley, Leith, June 5, 1573. There is a passage in his letter which is curious. He says, "By computation there hath been near 3000 great shot bestowed against the castle in this service, and the bullets of all or the most part recovered, and brought again, part by our own labours, and part by the Scots, paying to the Scottish people a piece of their coin called a *bawbee* for every bullet, which is in value English, one penny and a quarter."

Burghley, warning him that the chief authors of all the mischief were now remaining, without condition, in the hands of Elizabeth's ministers, entreating the queen's immediate decision upon their fate, and requesting them to be delivered to him, that they might suffer for their crimes.[1] Killigrew, too, had the barbarity to advise their execution; and Drury anxiously awaited his next orders. At this trying moment, Grange and Lethington addressed the following letter to one who had once been knit to them in ties of the strictest friendship, the Lord Treasurer Burghley:—

"MY LORD,—The malice of our enemies is the more increased against us, that they have seen us rendered in the queen's majesty's will, and now to seek refuge at her highness's hands. And, therefore, we doubt not but they will go about by all means possible to procure our mischief; yea, that their cruel minds shall lead them to that impudency to crave our bloods at her majesty's hands. But whatsoever their malice be, we cannot fear that it shall take success; knowing with how gracious a princess we have to do, which hath given so many good proofs to the world of her clemency and mild nature, that we cannot mistrust that the first example of the contrary shall be shewn upon us. We take this to be her very natural, *Parcere subjectis, et debellare superbos.*

"We have rendered ourselves to her majesty, which to our own countrymen we would never have done, for no extremity [that] might have come. We trust her majesty will not put us out of her hands to make any others, especially our mortal enemy, our masters. If it will please her majesty to extend her most gracious clemency towards us, she may be as assured to have us as perpetually at her devotion as any of this nation, yea, as any subject of her own; for now with honour we may oblige ourselves to her majesty farther than before we might, and her majesty's benefit will bind us perpetually. In the case we are in we must confess we are of small value; yet may her majesty put us in case, that perhaps hereafter we will be able to serve her majesty's turn, which occasion being offered, assuredly there shall be no inlack of good-will. Your lordship knoweth already what our request is; we pray your lordship to further it. There was never time wherein your lordship's friendship might stand us in such stead. As we have oftentimes heretofore tasted thereof, so we humbly pray you let it not inlack us now, in time of this our great misery, when we have more need than ever we had. Whatsoever our deservings have been, forget not your own good natural. If, by your lordship's mediation, her majesty conserve us, your lordship shall have us perpetually bound to do you service. . . . Let not the misreports of our enemies prevail against us. When we are in her majesty's hands she may make us what pleaseth her. . . . From Edinburgh, the 1st June 1573."[2]

This letter produced no effect. Elizabeth, indeed, did not instantly decide, and requested particular information to be sent her of the "quality and quantity of the prisoners' offences;" but Killigrew and Morton so strongly advised their execution, that the queen commanded them to be delivered up to the regent, to be dealt with as he pleased. This, as she must have known, was equivalent to signing their death-warrant. Before, however, the final order arrived, Lethington died in prison. It was reported that he had swallowed poison; but the rumour was uncertain, and was treated by many as an invention of his enemies.[3] Ten days after this, Drury reluctantly complied with the orders of Elizabeth, and delivered Grange, Hume, John Maitland, (Lethington's younger brother,) and Robert Melvil, to the re-

[1] MS. Letter, British Museum, Caligula, C. iv. fol. 85, dorso, Morton to Burghley, May 31, 1573.

[2] MS. Letter, British Museum, Caligula, C. iv. fol. 86, Lethington and Grange to Lord Burghley, June 1, 1573.

[3] British Museum, Caligula, C. iv. fol. 97, copy, Elizabeth to Morton, June 9, 1570. Ibid., fol. 101, Killigrew to Burghley, June 12, 1573. Also MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Killigrew to Burghley, June 20, 1573.

gent;[1] Grange's brother (Sir James Kirkaldy) being already in Morton's hands.

Much interest was now exerted to save the life of Grange, but without success: he had made himself too conspicuous, and his talents for war were much dreaded by his adversaries. A hundred gentlemen, his friends and kinsmen, offered for his pardon to become perpetual servants to the house of Angus and Morton in "bond of manrent," a species of obligation well known in those times, and to pay two thousand pounds to the regent, besides an annuity of three thousand merks; but although Morton's prevailing vice was avarice, he was compelled to resist the temptation, influenced, as he stated in a letter to Killigrew, by the "denunciations of the preachers,"[2] who cried out that God's plague would not cease till the land were purged with blood. They were aware of the prediction of Knox, so recently uttered upon his deathbed, that Grange should be shamefully dragged from the rock wherein he trusted, and hanged in the face of the sun. The success of Drury had fulfilled the first part, and the violence with which the ministers opposed every intercession for mercy, affords a melancholy proof of their determination that the second head of the reputed prophecy should be as punctually accomplished.

Nor were they disappointed. On the 3d of August, Sir William Kirkaldy and his brother were brought from Holyrood to the cross of Edinburgh, and executed in the presence of an immense concourse of spectators. They were attended on the scaffold by Mr David Lindsay, a martial clergyman of those times, to whose hands, if we may believe Melvil, it was difficult to say whether the Bible or the hagbut were most congenial instruments. Grange received his ministrations with gratitude, and expressed on the scaffold deep penitence for his sins and unshaken attachment to his captive sovereign.[3]

Thus died the famous Laird of Grange, a gentleman who, although his character will not bear examination if we look to consistency and public principle, was justly reputed one of the best soldiers and most accomplished cavaliers of his time.[4]

The year 1573 was thus fatal to the cause of Mary, whose last hope expired with the execution of this brave man, and the surrender of the castle of Edinburgh. In England she had seen all her plans blasted by the death of Norfolk and the imprisonment of the Bishop of Ross: to France she could no longer look for active interference in her behalf, for Elizabeth had recently entered into the defensive treaty of Blois, with that kingdom; and Catherine of Medicis was negotiating a marriage between the English queen and her son the Duke d'Alençon, a proposal hollow indeed, and insincere on both sides, yet, for the time, rendering all interference with Scotland on the part of France unadvisable. Even Spain she could no longer regard with any confidence. The Duke of Alva was the friend and secret correspondent of Burghley and Elizabeth; and although the Roman Catholic refugees in Flanders were incessant in their intrigues, and Philip himself seemed disposed to annoy her on the side of Ireland and Scotland, the influence of this minister effectually counteracted any decided enterprise.[5] With the death of Kirkaldy, therefore, the reign of Mary properly terminates; for immediately after that event, her last intrepid supporter, Sir Adam Gordon of Auchendown, retired to France; and from that period till her death, no subject dared to acknowledge her as his sovereign.

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Drury to Burghley, Leith, June 18, 1573.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Morton to Killigrew, August 5, 1573. See Proofs and Illustrations, No. XXVI. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 336.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Killigrew to Burghley, August 3, 1573. Melvil's Diary, pp. 26-28.

[4] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 257. His character of Grange is very expressive. "He was," says he, "humble, gentle, and meek; like a lamb in the house, but a lion in the field; a lusty, stark, and well-proportioned personage, and of a hardy and magnanimous courage." See also Melvil's Diary, p. 28.

[5] Gonzalez, pp. 370, 371.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

LETTER A, page 22.

Cruelty and Impolicy of Henry the Eighth towards Scotland.

THE savage temper of Henry the Eighth nowhere more strongly appears than in the directions which, on the 10th of April 1543–4, he transmitted through a despatch of the Privy-council to the Earl of Hertford. After observing that the grand attempt on Scotland was delayed for a season, they command him, in the meantime, to make an inroad into Scotland, "there to put all to fire and sword, to burn Edinburgh town, and to raze and deface it, when you have sacked it, and gotten what you can out of it, as that it may remain for ever a perpetual memory of the vengeance of God lighted upon it, for their falsehood and disloyalty. Do what you can," continue they, "out of hand, and, without long tarrying, to beat down and overthrow the castle, sack Holyrood House, and as many towns and villages about Edinburgh as ye conveniently can; sack Leith, and burn and subvert it, and all the rest, *putting man, woman, and child, to fire and sword*, without exception, when any resistance shall be made against you; and this done, pass over to the Fife land, and extend like extremities and destructions in all towns and villages whereunto ye may reach conveniently, not forgetting, amongst all the rest, so to spoil and turn upside down the cardinal's town of St Andrews, *as the upper stone may be the nether*, and not one stick stand by another, *sparing no creature alive* within the same, specially such as either in friendship or blood be allied to the cardinal." "This journey," the despatch goes on to state, "shall succeed most to his majesty's honour."[1]

LETTER B, pages 22, 38, 47, and 48.

Historical Remarks on the Assassination of Cardinal Beaton.

The assassination of Cardinal Beaton is an event which has been viewed under very different aspects by different parties. The exultation and unseasonable pleasantry with which Knox relates the murder are partly to be ascribed to the savage times in which he was bred, and to the natural temper of this singular man, which was strongly tinctured with a love of the humorous. That he considered the deed as not only justifiable but almost praiseworthy, is evident from the whole tone of his narrative. This mode of writing naturally roused to the highest pitch the indignation of the Roman Catholic party; it was received with equal reprobation by the more moderate Protestants; whilst the Covenanters, driven by the harsh persecution of the government to acts similar in their manner of perpetration, although dictated by higher and less selfish motives, eagerly defended a proceeding which seemed to justify their own. The consequence of this has been, that much vituperation and inconclusive argument were elicited; nor have these angry indications completely subsided in the present day. Such feelings are particularly unpropitious to the investigation of historical truth; and setting them aside entirely, I proceed more fully than was permitted me in the

[1] From the MS. Catalogue of the Hamilton Papers, pp. 44, 45.

text to investigate this subject, and to present my readers with some extracts from those original papers and letters which throw new light upon it, and have hitherto remained unknown.

Dr Mackenzie, in his Lives of Scottish Writers, (vol. iii. p. 23,) early observed that the assassination of Beaton had been planned in England, and to corroborate his opinion published from a document, which he affirmed he had seen in the Library of the Faculty of Advocates, an extract from the letter of the Earl of Hertford, dated 17th April 1544, and quoted in my text. When Keith published his history (in 1734) this letter could not be found, and, although he gives it from Mackenzie's work, he declines pronouncing any opinion, aware of that author's great inaccuracy. When Robertson, in 1759, published his History of Scotland, he considered the subject so obscure that he satisfied himself with expressing a suspicion that there existed a correspondence between the murderers of Cardinal Beaton and Henry the Eighth; and many years after, when Dr Cook gave to the world his History of the Reformation, he got rid of the difficulties attending the question in too summary a manner, by doubting whether such a letter was ever written, or such a person as Wishart, mentioned as the agent of the conspiracy, ever came to the Earl of Hertford, or was sent by him to Henry the Eighth. "The letter," says he, "is entitled to no credit. It was not found by one of our most accurate inquirers into points of history, where the writer who quotes it asserts it may be seen; and what is completely decisive, it was said to have been written two years before the cardinal's death, and could, therefore, have no relation to a conspiracy, which it is apparent was not in existence till within a very short time of its being carried into execution." In a short historical disquisition appended to an early work, (Life of Sir Thomas Craig, published in 1823,) I pointed out the errors contained in this passage, and established the authenticity of the letter quoted by Mackenzie, by referring to a direct answer to it which occurred in the collection of original letters and papers published by Haynes, vol. i. p. 34. The fact of the existence of a conspiracy for the assassination of Beaton, which was fostered in England, and carried on by Brunston and Wishart, was thus fixed beyond question. To crown the whole, it turned out that, after an interval of many years, Dr Robertson had discovered in the MS. collection of the Duke of Hamilton, and had published in the latest edition of his history, the original of the letter quoted by Mackenzie. Thus far had the truth been ascertained, when I was last year permitted by Lord Melbourne to have a full examination of the Scottish correspondence in the State-paper Office, an event which I must consider as one of the most pleasurable in my literary life. This examination is at present only in progress, but the documents I have there found have already enabled me to trace my way through some of the most obscure portions of our national history; and one of these relates to the English conspiracies for the assassination of Cardinal Beaton. I proceed now to point out the singular letters which illustrate the progress of the conspiracy.

It may first, however, be proper to remark that Henry's antipathy to Beaton was early excited, and soon assumed a violent form. On hearing that the cardinal had procured his removal from Lord Seton's house, where he was kept in custody, to St Andrews, the king (not aware that the crafty prelate had by this step completely recovered his liberty) proposed to Sir George Douglas, through Sadler, his ambassador, that he should be brought to England and there kept in sure custody. This was on the 30th March 1543, (Sadler's State-papers, vol. i. pp. 104, 106.) A similar proposal for the apprehension of the cardinal was made on the 21st June 1543, (Sadler, vol. i. p. 221,) which was reiterated in strong terms to Arran the governor by the English monarch on the 4th of August, (Sadler, vol. i. p. 249;) and it appears that Beaton had received warning of these hostile intentions, for, on the 28th of August 1543, he refused to leave his castle of St Andrews for the purpose of meeting with Arran the governor, alleging that he was afraid of his life, (Sadler, vol. i. p. 278.) On the 5th of October, the lords of Henry's party, expressed an earnest wish that the cardinal were in the king's majesty's hands, so that he might never more trouble the realm of Scotland, (Sadler, vol. i. p. 312.) This rooted enmity to the cardinal, in the mind of Henry, was well known to Crichton, the Laird of Brunston, a man in whose character we recognise the

ferocity and familiarity with blood which marks the feudal times in which he lived, the cunning and duplicity which is the growth of a more civilised era, and this united to a fanatical spirit which perhaps deceived him into the belief that he was a sincere friend of truth. Busy, unscrupulous, and active, this pliant intriguer insinuated himself into the confidence of all parties, and seems to have been willing at various times to desert all, till the money of England fixed him by the powerful chain of self-interest in the service of Henry the Eighth. We first meet with him as a familiar and confidential servant of Cardinal Beaton, intrusted with secret letters from that dignitary to Rome, (10th December 1539. Sadler, vol. i. p. 25,) which were intercepted by Henry the Eighth. He next attached himself to Arran the governor, who thought him worthy to be trusted in diplomatic missions to France and England, (Sadler, vol. i. pp. 186, 280;) and it would seem that on the 28th of August 1543 Sadler had not much intimacy with him, as he denominates him "a gentleman called the Laird of Brunston." In a few months, however, Brunston had deserted Arran, and so completely gained the confidence both of Sadler and his royal master, that we find him furnishing secret intelligence to the ambassador, and honoured by a letter from the king, (Sadler, vol. i. pp. 332, 338, 339, 342.) On the 16th of November 1543, Brunston thus writes in a letter to Sadler: " . . I pray your lordship that I may be excused to the king's majesty, and to thank his highness on my behalf of his gentle letter, which it hath pleased his highness to send to me, the contents whereof I shall not fail to fulfil, so far as God will give me grace," (Sadler, vol. i. p. 342.)

Nearly five months after this, on the 17th April 1544, the Laird of Brunston engaged in that secret correspondence with Henry the Eighth, in which, on certain conditions, he offered to procure the assassination of Beaton.[1] As the purport of both letters has been fully stated in the text, I shall not recapitulate it, but merely observe that, in the plot devised by Brunston, and proposed to be executed by Kirkaldy of Grange and the Master of Rothes, the conspirators do not appear to have acted from

by poste, bothe for the delyvire of suche letters as he hathe to your majestie from the said Brunstone, and also for the declaracion of his credence, which, as I can perceyve by him, consisteth in two poyntes; one is, that the Larde of Graunge, late thresaurer of Scotlande, the mr of Rothes, th' Erl of Rothis eldest son, and John Charters, wolde attempt eyther t' apprehend or slee the cardynall at some tyme when he shall passe thoroughe the Fyf lande, as he doth sundrye times to Sanct Andrewes; and in case they can so apprehende hym, will delyver him unto your majestie, which attemptat, he saythe, they wolde enterpryse if they knew your majestie's pleasure therein, and what supportacion and mayntenance your majestie wolde minister unto them efter th' execution of the same, in case they suld be persewed afterwards be any of their enemyes; the other is, that in cace your maj. wolde grant unto them a convenient enterteynement for to kepe 15 or 16 men in wages for a moneth or two, they, joyning with the power of th' Erl Marshall, the said Erl of Rothes, the Larde of Calder, and others of the Lords Grey's friends, will tak upon them, at such tyme as your maj. armey sall be in Scotlande, to destroy the abbey and town of Arbroyth, being the cardynal's and all th' other bishops and abbots houses and countreys on that syde the water thereaboute, and apprehend all those whiche they saye be the principall impugnators of the amyte between England and Scotland, for the whiche they suld have a good opportunytie, as they saye, when the power of the said bishops and abbote shall resort toward Edinburgh to resist your majestye's armye. And for th' execution of these thinges, the said Wyshert saith that the sayde Erll Marshall, and others above named, will capitulate with your majestie in wryting under their handes and seales afore they shall desyre any suplye of money at your majes. handes. This is the effect of his credence, with other sundrie advertisements of the great contencion and division that is at this present within the realme of Scotlande, which we doubt not he will declare unto your majestie at good length.

"Also, I, the said Erll of Hertford, have receyved this daye, certain letters from the Lorde Wharton, and Sir Robert Bowes, with the copies of suche letters as were wryten by the Erll of Glencairne's sone, and Bishop the Erl of Lennox's secretary, to be sent into Scotland to the same erlles, which copies the said Lord Wharton and Bowes atteyned to such meynes as sall appear unto your majestie by the said letters, whiche, with the said copies, we send also to your highnes here inclosed; together with certain other letters, whiche arryved here also this dav

[1] His grace the Duke of Hamilton, many years ago, politely permitted me to copy the original of the letter from the Earl of Hertford, which is in his possession. "Please it your highness to understand, that this daye arryved here with me the Erll of Hertford, a Scotishman called Wyshert, and brought me a letter from the Larde of Brunstone, which I sende your highness herewith; and, according to his request, have taken order for the repayre of the said Wysshert to your majestie

religious, or I should rather say fanatical, motives. No allusion to such is to be found in the correspondence. Their views seem to have been purely selfish and mercenary. The "feat," however, against the cardinal, for some cause not easily discoverable, was not at this time carried into execution, and the conspiracy slept for nearly a year, when it was again revived by the Earl of Cassillis, the pupil of Buchanan, the convert of Cranmer,[1] and a nobleman who, in their ignorance of his true character, has been highly lauded by some of our historians. This baron, who proved himself one of Henry's most active instruments, was employed by this monarch, in April 1545, in a negotiation regarding the marriage and the peace, of which an account has been given in the text. Previous to this diplomatic mission, he repaired to the English court from Scotland, and having received his instructions from Henry in person, returned to manage the business in the Scottish parliament. In the State-paper Office there is an original letter, dated April 2, 1545, entirely in cipher, with a contemporary deciphered copy, from the Earl of Cassillis to the king, in which he states that he had a conference with the governor and the cardinal on the subject of his mission, but they would come to no conclusion till the arrival of the queen and the Earls of Argyle and Huntly; and adds, that a convention had been summoned for the 15th, to determine on his offers. On the 20th of April, Cassillis again addressed a letter in cipher to the king, in which he informed him of the total failure of his negotiation, the triumph of the party of the cardinal and the governor, and the rejection of peace with England. On the 18th of May 1545, Sir R. Sadler, and the Council of the North, wrote to the king, transmitting a letter in cipher, which the Earl of Cassillis had addressed to Sadler. That the reader may understand the purport of Sadler's letter, I give an extract from it:—"Please your royal Majesty to receive herewith such letters as we have received from the Lord Wharton, with others in cipher addressed unto us with the same from the Earl of Cassillis; whereof one of them is a letter to the same Erle from the Erle Marshall, as your Majesty shall perceyve, which we have deciphered, and sende herewith unto your Majesty, both the cipher, and the same deciphered accordingly. And when it may appear unto your highness by the said Earle of Cassillis' lettres, amongst other things, that he intendeth to procure one to be sent to me, Sir Rafe Sadleyr, as sone as is possible, for him to speke with th' Erle of Anguisse and George Douglas, for such purposes as your highness has appoynted with the saide Earl of Cassillis. I, the said Sir Rafe Sadleyr, shall not faile, as soon as I shall heare of the comyng of such a one as they will sende, to repayre to Alnewyke, there to commune with him according to such instructions as I lately received from the lords of his majesty's council in that behalf, and touching such matter as the said Erle of Cassillis now hath written of to your Highness, wherein he seemeth desirous to know your Majesty's pleasure by me, I shall be ready to say and do as it shall please your Highness to command me in that part or anie other, according to my most bounden dutie." The rest of this letter is unimportant. From the above extract it is, however, evident that the king had communicated certain purposes to Cassillis; that Cassillis, having first consulted with the Earl of Angus and Sir George Douglas, was to send a secret messenger to Alnwick, to commune with Sir Ralph Sadler touching such purposes; that Sir Ralph had already received from the Privy-council instructions regarding this intended communication; that Cassillis had, moreover, written to the king upon another private matter, in which he wished to know the royal pleasure through Sir Ralph, and that this statesman only waited to hear his majesty's opinion, that he might communicate it to the Scottish earl. The importance

from the Lord ———,'conteyning certain exploytes done in Scotlande.

"Fynally—the Lorde Wm. Howard being at Tynemont, sent a letter to me, the said Erll of Hertford, whereby it appeareth that certain of the shippis victuallers are arrivid, and some of theym report that yesterday morning they sawe my Lord Admyrall, west of the fleete on see borde Hull, makyng hitherwarde, so that the wind contynuing as it is, they will be at Teynemouth this night or to-morrawe with the grace of God, who preserve your royall majestie in your most prynceley estat, most felycitously to endure unto your highnes.—Newcastel, the xvii. of April.

"Your Majestie's humble subjects, and most bounden servants,

"E. Hertford, *Cuth. Duresme.*

"Robert Landaffe, Raf Sadleyr."

[1] Douglas' Peerage, vol. i. pp. 330, 331.

of this minute analysis will immediately appear.

It is unfortunate that the letter in cipher from the Earl of Cassillis to the king, mentioned in the above despatch, is not to be found in the State-paper Office; but, on the 21st of May 1545, there is a letter from the Council of the North to the king, informing his majesty that the Scottish barons, Angus, Cassillis, Glencairn, Marshal, and Sir George Douglas, had declined, as they at first intended, sending an agent to Alnwick to confer with Sir Ralph Sadler; and thought it better that a confidential messenger should be sent into Scotland to deliberate with them. This letter from the Council of the North to the king is autograph of Sir Ralph Sadler. It contains this passage:—"And whereas I, the said Sir Rafe, was advertised from the lords of your majestie's council that your highness' pleasure was, I should repayre to Alnwick, to meet there with a gentleman that should be sent from the Erles of Anguisse, Cassillis, Glencairn, Marshall, and George Douglas and others, for such purposes as I was also then advertised from my said lords of his majestie's council, for the whiche jorney I have been in a readiness, according to your most gracious pleasure; it shall now appear to your highness, by the said Erle of Cassillis' lettres, that they have chaunged that purpose, and would have me send a gentleman to them with such instructions, and in such sorte, as your majestie shall perceive by the said Erle of Cassillis' lettres." This letter from the Earl of Cassillis to Sir Ralph Sadler, alluded to above as having been transmitted to the king, is not to be found in the State-paper Office, but its purport clearly appears from a letter of the English Privy-council, dated May 30, 1545. The importance of this document induces me to give an extract. It shews, I think, that although they contain no direct mention of it, the former letters, of the 18th and 21st of May, related to the designs against Beaton's life, and it reveals for the first time a plot that has remained hidden for nearly three centuries. The despatch is in the handwriting of Mr Secretary Paget, except the last sentence, which is the autograph of Wriothesley, then chancellor. It is addressed to the Earl of Hertford. "After our most harty commendations unto your good lordship, it may like the same to understand that the king's majesty, having of late seen certain lettres sent from th' Erle of Cassillis unto Mr Saddleyr, *the same containing an offer for the kylling of the cardinal if his majesty wold have it done, and wold promise, when it were done, a reward;* the other excusing the change of their purpose for sending of one from them to meet with Mr Saddleyr upon the Borders, and requiring John Forster (who, they say, being prisonir, may come well without suspition) should be sent to commune with them, and to as well signify unto them the king's majestie's pleasure towards them, as to hear again what they would do for their parts: To the first point his majestie hath willed us to signify unto your lordschip, that his highness, reputing the fact not mete to *be set forward expressly by his majesty, will not seem to have to do in it; and yet, not misliking the offer*, thinketh good that Mr Saddleyr, to whom that letter was addressed, should write to th' Erle of the receipt of his letter, conteyning such an offer, which he thinketh not convenient to be communicated to the king's majesty; marry, to write to him what he thinketh of the matter, he shall say, that if he were in th' Erle of Cassillis' place, and were as able to do his majesty good service there as he knoweth him to be, and thinketh a right good will in him to do it, he would surely do what he could for th' execution of it, believing verily to do thereby not only an acceptable service to the king's majesty, but also a special benefit to the realme of Scotland, and would trust verily the king's majesty would consider his service in the same; as you doubt not of accustomed goodness to them which serve him, but he would do the same to him."[1] The remaining portion of this letter, which is an original, and signed by seven privy-councillors, relates to the sending Forster into Scotland, and to other matters not important to be noticed.

To go on unravelling these dark designs, it next appears, by a letter from the Council of the North to the king, dated June 3, 1545, that Forster had been sent for, to be despatched forthwith into Scotland, and, upon his arrival, Sadler informs his majesty, "that he will write to the Earl of Cassillis, according to the directions contained in the last letter from the Privy-council."

[1] Original, State-paper Office, never before published.

Hitherto the conspiracy of the Earl of Cassillis for the assassination of Beaton does not seem to be connected in any way with the former plot of Brunston, Wishart, Kirkaldy of Grange, and Norman Lesley; but the above letter contains a sentence from which a strong presumption arises that the conspiracy of Cassillis was merely a revival of that of Brunston. "Also, here arrived presentlie a lettre in cipher from the Laird of Brunstone, which we have caused to be deciphered herewith to your majesty." Here the despatch of the Privy-council which was sent concludes with the usual prayer for the royal health; but in the scroll of that despatch, which is autograph of Sir Ralph Sadler, after the words "your majestie," the following sentence succeeds:—"And this day Sir Thomas Holcroft shewed us a cipher, which was devised betwix him and the said Brunston, when Brunston departed last from the court, upon the perusing of which cipher we fynd it to be the very same that is betwix your majesty and th' Erle of Cassillis, as your majestie shall perceive upon the sight of it, which we send hêre inclosed, so that it appeareth to us that both the Erle of Cassillis and Brunston"—here this additional sentence, which is scored through, breaks off abruptly; but it is evident, I think, the Privy-council intended to observe that it appeared to them that Brunston and Cassillis were in close communication with each other upon the point touching the murder of the cardinal, and, when we weigh all the circumstances, it is difficult to resist the same conclusion. Brunston formerly had submitted to Henry a plot for the assassination of Beaton; Brunston was an intimate friend and supporter of the party with whom Cassillis acted; Brunston had lately been at court, and had arranged a cipher for a secret correspondence with Sir Thomas Holcroft: at the moment when Cassillis again proposes to Henry the assassination of the prelate, a letter in cipher is sent from Brunston to the Council of the North, and instantly transmitted to the king; and lastly, Brunston and Cassillis are found using the same cipher. Every circumstance shews a unity of schemes, and an intimacy of communication, from which we may infer, I think, that the second conspiracy of Cassillis was merely a revival or continuation of the first by Brunston. The king, however, as we have seen, did not choose to give direct encouragement to the proposal of Cassillis. That noble person was informed by Sadler that he had *not* communicated his design to the monarch, (which was untrue;) and Cassillis, although willing to commit murder upon a written order from the king, did not choose to peril himself in any such business upon the bare recommendation of Sir Ralph Sadler. He did not even vênture to reply to Sadler's letter upon this delicate point; and, in the succeeding interview which took place between him and Forster, the English agent, at Douglas, in June, he appears carefully to have avoided any allusion to the subject. The proposal of Sir George Douglas to this envoy, that Henry, "if he would have the cardinal dead, should promise a good reward for the doing thereof," has been noticed in the body of this history, but Forster (July 4, 1545) returned without having had any communication with Cassillis upon the subject.

The Laird of Brunston, however, was resolved that the proposal for removing their great enemy should not so easily drop; and on the 12th of July we find, by the following extract from a letter of the Council of the North to the Privy-council, that this busy intriguer had renewed to the king and to his council the atrocious proposal:—"After our most hartie commendations, yesterday arrived here lettres in cypher to the king's majesty from the Larde of Brunston, and also to me, Sir Rafe Sadleyr, which we have deciphered and sende herewith, both the cipher and the same deciphered, unto you, which we praye you to declare and showe unto the king's majestie. And forasmuch as the said Brunston doth partly in his said letters [touch] the matter which concerneth the kylling of the cardinal, because, as we perceyve by such letters, as I, th' Erll of Hertford, have received from the Lordes, you, and others of the counsaill, his majestie will not seeme to have to do in that matter, but referreth the same to the handeling of me, Sir Rafe Sadleyr: I, therefore, have taken occasion upon the said Brunston's letters to write my mind to him in that matter, in such sorte as you shall perceyve by the copie of my lettre to the said Brunston, which you shall receyve herewith."[1]

[1] Original, State-paper Office, never before published. Since this note was written the

Sadler goes on to state that he had written before this upon the same matter of the killing of the cardinal to the Earl of Cassillis, but since then had received no answer. The rest of his letter is of little interest; but the enclosure, entitled the "Copie of Sir Rafe Sadleyr's Lettres to the Larde of Brunston," which is wholly in Sir Ralph's own hand, is too important and curious to be omitted. It commences thus:—"After my right hartie commendations, I have received your lettres by Robert Lyster, this bearar, with also your lettres addressed to the king's majestie, which shall be depesched hens to his highness with such spede as appertayneth. In one parte of your said lettres, I note chieflie, that certayn gentlemen, being your friends, have offred *for a small soume of money*, to take hym oute of the waye, that hath been the hole impediment and lett to all good purposes there, so that they might be sure to have the king's majestie their good lorde; and that his majestie woolde rewarde them for the same. Of this I judge that you mean the cardinall, whome I knowe to be so much blynded to his own affection to France, that, to please the same he seeth not, but utterlie contempnyth all thinges tending to the weale and benefite of his owne countrey; and, indede, hitherto, he hath been the onelie cause and worker of all your myschief, and will, if he continewe, be undoubtedlie the utter ruyne and confusion of the same. Wherefore I am of your opinion, *and as you write, thinke it to be acceptable service to God to take him oute of the waye*, whiche, in suche sorte dothe not onelie as much as in him is to obscure the glorie of God, but also to confound the commonweale of his owne countrey. And albeit, the king's majestie, whose gracious nature and goodnes I knowe, *wool not I am sure, have to do ne meddle with this matier touching your said cardynall*, for soundrie considerations; yet, if you could so worke the matier with these gentlemen your freends, which have made that offer, that it maye take effect, you shall undoubtedly doo therein good service, both to God and his majestie, and a singular benefit to your countrey. Wherefore, lyke as if I were in your place, it shulde be the first thing I woolde earnestlie attempt, thinking therby for the respect aforesaide chieflie to please God, and to do good to my countrey." Sadler goes on to state that, if Brunston and his friends put the matter in execution, he knows so well the king's goodness and liberality, that they may assure themselves of a reward; and he adds this remarkable sentence, "And if the execution of this matier doo rest onelie uppon the rewarde of the king's majestie to such as shall be the executors of the same, I pray you advertyse me what rewarde they do requyre, and if it be not unreasonable, because I have been in your countrey, *for the Christen zeal* that I have to the commonweale of the same, I will undertake it shall be payed immediatlie upon the act executed, though I doo myselfe beare the charge of the same, whiche I woolde thinke well imployed. . . . . Thus I write to you mine owne phantasie and mynde in this matier, as one that woolde be glad to give you such advise, as wherby you shulde doo that service to God, the kinge's majestie, and your owne natyve countrey, as might also be to your owne profett, and good fame."[1]

The Laird of Brunston, however, and the friends with whom he acted, although willing for a small reward to slay the cardinal, proved as cautious and crafty as the Earl of Cassillis, and did not choose to undertake the murder without a direct communication with the king's majesty; they had determined to have the royal warrant and writ for their reward and their security; and on hearing that Sadler had not imparted their offer to the king, but only encouraged them out of his Christian zeal, and of his own phantasy, they for the present dropt their atrocious project. This letter of Sadler's was dated 4th of July 1545; and for nearly three months we can trace nothing of the plot against the cardinal. How the interval was occupied is shewn in this history. The invasion of Hertford, and the many miserable scenes which it brought in its train, gave ample employment to all parties in Scotland. Beaton, however, was still able to thwart the schemes of Henry, and that monarch evinced the continuance of his mortal enmity against the prelate, by recommending the Earl

letter has been printed in the Collection of State Papers published by Government, vol. v. part iv. p. 470.

1 Original, State-paper Office, never before published. Since printed in the State Papers published by Government, vol. v. part iv. p. 470.

of Hertford to advise the French deserters to shew their desire to be of service, by *trapping or killing the cardinal*, Lorges, or the governor. This was on the 9th of September 1545, and on the 6th of October, about a month after, we find pretty strong evidence that the plot for the assassination of Beaton had been resumed by Brunston. At this time, the following letter in cipher was sent by that busy intriguer to Henry the Eighth:—

"My deuty usit to your most excellent majeste; it will plese zour highnes, yat at yis last convention the Earl of Lennox is forfaltit, his brother the bischoip, and the Larde of Tulibarn, continewit to the nixt meeting betuyx yis and Chrismes. As tô other gret actis ya haif none. Yai haif providit one thowsand horsmen to ly on the Bordouris, five hundreth of the Mers, and other five hundreth of Tevidail, such as hes no other thing to leif by.

"Morovir, yt wil lyk zour majeste, yat I am suirly advertesed by one yat knowith yt, wich ys one suir frend of myn, yat the cardinal passis to France with the Freach king's leutenant, who, as I beleif, taryis for nothing but for his shippis, the which are sent for alrady. The said cardinal entendis (yf his devising tak effect) to bring us gret support in the foir yere; but I hoip to God his *jornay shall be shortit to his displeseur*. He ys laborand to haif the yong queen to remane in his castel of Sanctandros, and causis the governor to beleif yat yt is for his effect to keip hir to his sone; and the queen-mother makis hir angrye withal, but I beleif she dissembles. Thair is no other thingis for the present worthye your majeste's knowledge; and as otheris occurris, your majeste shal be advertest wyth such diligence as I may; alwayis assuring your highnes yat *yair wes nevir mo gentil men desyrous to serve your* majeste to the avansing of your majestes godlye entent, nor yair is now." This letter is dated "at Ormistoun yis saxt day of October, be him yat is desirous to do your highnes service at the uttermost of his power—Bronstoun."[1]

[1] Original, State-paper Office, not before published. The Earl of Hertford in his letter transmits the cipher as from the Laird of Ormiston. On deciphering, it appears to be from Brunston. This letter was deciphered by Mr Robert Lemon, of the State-paper Office—a gentleman to whose skill in the knowledge of ancient manuscripts I have been often indebted.

After this letter, dated the 6th of October, there is no further correspondence between Brunston and the English government till the 20th of the same month. We then, however, find the following letter, addressed by that person to the Earl of Hertford:—"This present shall be to let your lordship wit, that sins the writting of my last letres, I talked at length with Sir George Douglas, who hath shewed me aunswer to the last letre that I send to your L., 'that the hole lords hath agreed to the marriage of the young quene to the governor's sonne with their seales and hand writtis,' and that he as yet hath stopped the Earl of Anguisse, with the rest of his friends, notwithstanding the diligent pursuit of the governor and his friends; which they seke both with great and fayer promises and other wayes, threteninges of the hole authoritye to cum in their contrary, which may not be resisted by them; nevertheless, I am suir that Sir George Douglas will staye th' Erle of Anguisse and all others his freindes, unto such time as he maye knowe the king's majestie's pleasur; and if the king's majestie will mak them such support that they may mak their party good in the contrary of the governour and authoritye, to the avaunсing of the king's majestie's affayres, they will [illegible] themselves and their friendes, and weir all their lyves or everything promised to the king's majestie be not kept; and in lik manner I shall cause all the gentlemen that your L. knoweth, my friends, to be readye as it shall please the king's majesty to command them [illegible] to assist to such as ar moost to the avaunсing of his majestie's affaires, as they have at all tymes been hitherto; *but his majestie must be plain with them, both what his majesty would have them to do, and in like manner what they shall lippen*[2] *to of his majesty;* which matier, with maney other matiers, I would gladly your L. knewe for the avaunсing of his majestie's affayres which wer too long to writ. Wherefore I have written, as your L. may see, to the king's majesty, desyring to speke with one of his majestie's counsaill, but in special with yr L. for the declaring of such things as I think gretely to the avaunсyng of his majestie's affaires, at the castle of Berwyk, wher, be suche daye as shall be appoynted me, God willing, I shall meet your L. *in secret manner*, geving me advertisement thre

[2] Lippen to—trust to.

or four before the tyme of meeting, which I pray your L. *in the most secret manner, for it standeth me beth in life and heretage if it be knowen;* at the whiche meeting I shall bring Sir G. Douglas' mind, with the rest of my friends, remitting all other things unto the tyme I have knowledge from your lordshipp, which I would were the soonest it was possible, as your L. loveth the welfare of the king's maj. affayres. This twenty of Octr. at Calder."[1]

The remainder of the letter is unimportant; but from its contents, and judging by the following extract from Brunston's letter to the king, we may presume that the business in which he and the gentlemen, his friends, offered their services to Henry was of the most treasonable description:—

"My duty used to your most princelie maj., it may pleis yr maj. that consydering the present estait of my cuntrey, and knowing the minds of one great part of the baronnis and noblemen thereof, the desyer to do your M. service in all that lyeth in my power, as I am moch bounden, and so moch the more that your majeste intendeth nothing but the wealth and benefit of my cuntrey, and that your majesty shall know I have not forgotten the gret liberalitye and gentlenes that both I and divers of the gentlemen, my friends, through me, hath found with yr M., (who shall all be any as I am one redy to serve yr M. at our powers,) moveth me for the declaracion of such things as I think gretly to th' avauncing of your majesties affayres, to be desyrous to speke with one of your majesties counsayl, and rather with Mr Sadleyr, nor with any other, becaus he is both neir to these parts, and best knoweth my cuntrey; who if it pleis your M. to sende to the castel of Berwyck, becaus it is unable to me to cum furth within the cuntrey unknowin, and at such day as shal be appoynted me, I shall (God willing) not fayle to mete him at the said town or castle, *which I would were as secret as were possible, for if it were to cum to knowledge, it is the losing to me both of life and heritage;* albeit I never knew one that lost for the servyng of yr majestie, which, as knoweth God, I am willing to do, being suir your majesty will both acknowledge me and others my friends, such as I have had grit relief of in the servyng of your majestie with the nombre of yr majestie's servands and friends. All such things as I both knowe and may lerne with the mynds of such as I tak to be yr majestie's friends, I shall shew at length to Mr Sadleyr, at such tyme as it shall pleas yr majy. that I meet him. Ther is non other thing for the present worthy your majestie's knowledge. Pray the eternal God to have your M. in his most blessed keeping. At Calder, this twenty of Octr. by your majestie's assured humble servitor,

"BROUNSTON.

"Hast the aunswer of these agayn to Coldingham."[2]

These last letters from the Laird of Brunston to Hertford and the king must be considered in connexion with what has already been proved against him. We have found him offering, on 17th April 1544, through Wishart, and by the assistance of his friends, Kirkaldy of Grange and the Master of Rothes, to apprehend or slay the cardinal. We find him, on the 2d April 1545, connected in the most intimate manner with the Earl of Cassillis, at the moment this nobleman renewed in his own person the proposal for the assassination of the cardinal. We find him again, on the 12th July 1545, sending a letter in cipher to the king, in which he renews the offer that certain gentlemen, his friends, were willing for a small sum of money to take the cardinal out of the way; and now, when in these letters we find him, on October 6, darkly alluding to his hopes that the cardinal's meditated journey to France will be cut short to his displeasure, and on the 26th of the same month arranging a secret interview with Sadler at Berwick, which, were it discovered, might affect his life, and, at the same moment, declaring that the gentlemen, his friends, were ready to obey his majesty's commands—but that the king must be plain with them, as to what he wishes them to do, and also how far they are to depend on his majesty's support—it is difficult, I think, to resist the conclusion that this last correspondence, as well as the former, regarded a fourth offer for the assassination of the prelate, and that the anxiety of Brunston and the gentlemen, his friends, to know Henry's wishes, and what support they were to expect from

[1] Original, State-paper Office, not before published.

[2] Original, State-paper Office, not before published.

him, arose out of the indirect and crafty manner in which this monarch, whilst he covertly encouraged the plot, insisted on making Sadler the ostensible agent in the nefarious transaction. At this critical moment, when Brunston, in his letter of the 20th of October, presses the king to be plain, the letters in the State-paper Office relative to the intrigues of this busy baron suddenly break off. Between the 20th and the 31st of October 1545 occur a few unimportant letters, and from that date to 27th March 1546, a period of nearly five months, there is a tantalising hiatus. If I may be allowed a conjecture, I would account for it in this way: Henry the Eighth was, as we see, very anxious not to appear directly in the matter, but the conspirators, Brunston's friends, would not act unless he dealt plainly with them; they would not take the indirect encouragement to commit the murder which Sadler gave as coming solely from himself—they wished to have the king's hand and writ to plead in their defence, and produce as their warrant for protection and remuneration, after the deed was perpetrated. I imagine the king was driven to give this, but the correspondence for this reason was destroyed—hence this hiatus at this most critical moment. There are no letters to be found from 27th March to 29th May which throw the slightest light upon the conspiracy against Beaton, and on the morning of that last-mentioned day the unfortunate man was murdered—the principal assassins being Kirkaldy of Grange and Norman Lesley, the Master of Rothes, the very men who two years before had offered, through the medium of Brunston, to apprehend or slay him as he passed through Fife. One thing to be regretted in the disappearance of all letters relative to the murder after the 20th of October is the want of evidence to shew any recent communication between Brunston and the assassins of the cardinal; but the inference, I think, is scarcely to be resisted that this daring and unscrupulous intriguer was as intimately implicated in the last as in the first conspiracy.

At the moment of their committing the murder, Grange, Lesley, and others of the principal conspirators were in the receipt of pensions from Henry the Eighth, and were described by that monarch as his friends and supporters;[1] and it is not unimportant to observe that, soon after the assassination, the Laird of Brunston was indicted on a charge of treason, although the process against him was afterwards withdrawn.

I shall conclude these historical remarks with the following interesting extract from the letter of a Scottish spy of Lord Wharton's, named James Lindsay, sending to that nobleman the first intelligence of the murder. It is one of three letters, all on the same subject, sent by Lord Wharton to the Privy-council of England:—

"Syr, to advertise zou, this satterday betwix v hours and vi in the mornyng the cardynal is slane in the castle of St Andrewes, be Normond Leslie, in yis maner: At the cumyng in of ye masonis and warkmen in ye place to the wark, Normond Leslie and thre wyth him enteret, and after hym James Melwin and thre men with him, and fenzit themselves to have spokin with the cardinal; and after yame came the zoung laird of Grange, and viii men with hym all in geir, quhilk the porter stoppit to lat in quhill ane of them strak him with ane knyiff and kest him in the hous. Incontynent they shot furth all the warkmen and closet the zet, syne seught the chalmer and shot furth all ye howsald men as thai gat thame mastrit. Ye cardinale herand ye dyn in his chalmer come furth, was passand to the blockehous head to heir quhat it was; Normond Leslie and his cumpanye met him in the torn pyk [off] and slew him; and after ya have depossest the place of all therein till, excep ye governor's sone, his priest and servand, and ye cardinal's chalmer child, ye common bell of ye toun rang, ye provest and town gadert to ye noumer of thre or four hundreth men, and come to ye castell, quhill Normond Leslie and his cumpanye come to ye wall heid and sperit quhat they desyrit to se, ane deid man. Incontynent ya brot ye cardinal deid to the wall heid in ane payr of shetis, and hang hym our ye wall be the tane arm and the tane fute, so bad ye pepill se yer thar God. This Johne of Douglas of Edinburt, Hew Douglas, Ayr, shaw me, and master Johne Douglas, quhilk was in Sanct Andrews and saw ye sam wyt yar ene.

"Wryten this Satterday at midnyt, zour servand,

"JAMES LYNDSAY."[2]

[1] Chalmer's Life of Mary, vol. iii. p. 340.

[2] Original, State-paper Office, not before published.

LETTER C, page 41.

Additional Illustrations from the Hamilton Manuscripts.

Since this volume passed through the press, I have seen, by the politeness of Mr James Chalmers, a Catalogue of the Hamilton Papers which belonged to his late uncle, the learned and indefatigable author of "Caledonia." These papers are in the possession of his Grace the Duke of Hamilton. The catalogue is a voluminous one, and contains occasional extracts from the letters and documents which it describes. Of these, the most valuable relate to the regency of the Earl of Arran and the minority of Mary; and it was gratifying to find that they not only confirmed, but greatly strengthened the views which I have given of that important period. Thus, with regard to the scheme of Henry for the entire subjection of Scotland under his dominion, and the mercenary manner in which the Scottish prisoners entered into his views, we have ample information in the following description of the contents of volume iv. of the Hamilton Papers:—

Volume iv. commences with December 1542, and ends with January and February 1542-3. It contains, amongst other occurrences, Henry's instructions to Sir Richard Southwell for conferring with the Earls of Bothwell and Angus, and also with the Scots prisoners, in order to engage them in his designs of subduing Scotland to himself, by possessing him of the government for the present, assuring the succession to him in case of the young queen's death, and granting him the tutelage of her person in the meantime, with the capital fortresses, and places of strength which he sought to have delivered into his power, together with the cardinal and another—*i.e.*, the Lord Regent—whom he looked on as his most dangerous opponents. In a minute addressed to Lord Viscount Lisle, January 8, 1542-3, Henry writes, "We have already given you advertisement how we have dismissed from hence the noblemen and others of Scotland our prisoners, and what the same have promised unto us." In what manner these promises were made appears from this extract from the Catalogue. Henry's articles with the Earl of Angus, then an exile in England for promoting the enterprise—his *open* articles, as he calls them—subscribed by the Scottish prisoners and Earl Bothwell, and his *secret* articles, subscribed by ten of these prisoners, the fittest, as he thought, to be trusted—namely, the Earls of Cassillis and Glencairn; the Lords Maxwell, Fleming, Somerville, and Gray; and by Robert Erskine, Oliver Sinclair, the Laird of Kerse, and John Ross of Craigy. Again, in Henry's instructions to Sir Ralph Sadler, in vol. v. of the Hamilton Papers, the English monarch states that Sir George Douglas had undertaken, not only by promise, but by *oath and bond*, to perform greater services than any of the rest. The treasonable extent of the engagements of the Earl of Angus and Sir George Douglas to Henry appear from a minute of the king to the Duke of Suffolk, dated November 12, 1543, in which that nobleman is directed to expostulate with Sir George Douglas regarding a fresh demand for money from England. "They have not stiked," says the English monarch, "to take upon them *to set the crown of Scotland upon our head.* Where has now become all their force and courage? . . . what meant they to take upon so great maistry and to be able to perform in deed so little?" Under the date of December 1543, we find a minute of a letter from the Duke of Suffolk to Henry's pensioners in Scotland, with an account of the sums of money which had been distributed to them, viz.:—

	STERLING.
To the Earl of Angus, . . .	200 £
,, of Glencairn, .	200 marks
,, of Cassillis, .	200 marks
To the Master of Maxwell,	100 £
To the Sheriff of Air, . .	100 £
To the Laird of Drumlanryk,	100 £
To the Earl of Marshall, John Charters, the Lord Gray's friends in the North, ...	300 marks
To Sir George Douglas and his friends in Lothian and Merse, ...	200 £

In the midst of so much venality and desertion on the part of the Scottish barons, it is pleasing to find an exception in the Earl of Argyle, who resisted more splendid offers than were made to any of the rest. This is shewn by a minute of the Privy-council of England to the Duke of Suffolk, preserved amongst the Hamilton Papers, by which it appears that the Laird of Drumlanrig, and the Sheriff of Ayr, (Campbell of Loudon,) had laboured to promote king Henry's designs, at some charge to them-

selves, and that, in satisfaction of that charge, they had received for the present five hundred crowns each, with the promise of a pension when the good fruits of their service should deserve it, particularly when they should accomplish the treaty which they had begun with the Earl of Argyle, *to make him a convert to Henry.* To induce his compliance, they were to make him a promise of one thousand crowns in hand, and a yearly pension of one thousand more; but if he would not comply, they were to "threaten him with the wild Irish, whom Henry was to hound, and to ruin both him and his country." It is shewn in this history that Argyle resisted the overtures of Henry, and that the wild Irish and men of the Isles were accordingly "hounded" upon him.

LETTER D, page 56.

Fiery Cross sent through Scotland.

"He sent the fiery cross throughout the country."—On this subject there is the following interesting entry in the MS. Books of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland, under the date 28th August 1547:—

"Item—My Lord Governor's grace being surely advertised that the army of England was at hand; to Mungo Strathern, messenger, letters of Proclamation, *with the Fire Cross*, to Kincardine, Aberdeen, Banff, Elgin, Forres, Cromarty, Nairn, Inverness, and Bills again, to the Earls of Huntly, Errol, and the Master of Forbes. iiii. lb.

"Item—To Normand, pursuivant, same letters, with the *Fire Cross*, to Linlithgow, Stirling, Clackmannan, Kinross, Perth, and all other quarters."

LETTER E, page 64.

State of Scotland after the Battle of Pinkie.

"The land was shamefully deserted by the greater part of its nobility."

This is a severe charge; but the following letters, selected from many others which I have transcribed from the State-paper Office, will prove that it is not unmerited. The leading nobles in Scotland at this time were the Earls of Angus, Huntly, Argyle, and Sir George Douglas, brother to Angus. All of them deserted the governor, and entered into secret and treasonable transactions with England. I proceed to prove this by the evidence of original letters.

On the 10th of September the Battle of Pinkie was fought, and on the 18th of the same month the Protector Somerset commenced his retreat. On the 20th of October, Lord Grey of Wilton addressed a letter to the Protector,[1] in which he gives the substance of an interview which passed between him and Sir George Douglas. "He," [Douglas,] says Grey, "liked well all the Articles, [alluding to the Secret Articles of Agreement mentioned in the text, p. 65,] except that by which, in the event of the young queen's marriage to any other than Edward the Sixth, they bind themselves to serve the king's majesty against their own country." "He began," [I use the words of Grey's letter]—"he began to allege what it was to forsake his native country and living there; he shewed me also that he had yearly of *the queen a stipend of one thousand crowns, and of the French king as much;* and now, since his being with me, the governor sent for him to speak to him, *and offered him an abbey of another thousand crowns by year:* but he came not at him, nor will not do; but if I would mitigate that article, he was contented with the rest. I shewed him that if he refused part he must refuse the whole. And then at the last he granted thereunto, *and hath both made his othe upon the testament to observe them*, and subscribed the same for a witness thereof, in sort as all others have done." Douglas entreated Grey to induce the Lord Protector to erase this article, which Grey assured him he was not likely to do. He then communicated his "*device*," which, with certain requests on his own behalf, Grey enclosed to Somerset. Douglas declared that he intended to go with them (the English army) himself, and be their guide; but enjoined secrecy of this private transaction, as, if it transpired, he should not be able to win his friends. I subjoin a brief abstract of the paper given in by Douglas, entitled, "The order of an Invasion into Scotland, devised by Sir George Douglas, to be attempted within a month after the date hereof, or six weeks at the furthest." He states that the number ought to be six thousand men—two thousand five hundred to be horse—and victuals in carriages sufficient for four days, for the whole. They should direct their march,—

First, To Jedburgh — to meet the

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lord Grey to the Protector, 20th October 1547.

Lairds of Fernyhirst and Cessford, and the rest of the gentlemen of Teviotdale, who must be sent for: no manner of spoil or hurt to be done.

Second, Journey to Selkirk—where they will meet Buccleuch and the rest of the gentlemen.

Third, To Peebles—to meet Lord Hay of Yester. (Sister's son to Douglas.)

Fourth, To Lanark—where the governor is sheriff. Here he would that the Earls of Angus, Cassillis, Glencairn, and the Lord Boyd should come in.

Fifth, To Glasgow; and *Sixth*, To Stirling.[1]

This crafty baron next handed in a paper, which he probably considered not the least important part of the transaction. It is entitled,

THE REQUESTS OF GEORGE DOUGLAS

For his own part: and consists of four stipulations. 1st, To have one thousand pounds sterling, within eleven days, to support himself, friends, and strengths, against the authority, and to have a yearly stipend of five hundred pounds sterling. 2d, His friends not to be opprest. 3d, That he may have his goods, silver, money, plate, and apparel, that he left in his hostess' house in Berwick, delivered to him. 4th, To have from the English king the keeping of the fort at Eyemouth. —— The Lord Grey, addressing Somerset, adds this emphatic sentence:—"Your Grace, I doubt not, considereth that this *man would not be won without money*, and albeit he demandeth a *thousand pounds* in hand, I doubt not but he will be satisfied with *a thousand marks*." These extracts sufficiently prove the venality and desertion of his country by Sir George Douglas. The following letter from Angus, his brother, to Sir Andrew Dudley, the English governor of the fort of Broughty, (see text, p. 63,) establishes the same fact against that nobleman:—

THE EARL OF ANGUS TO SIR ANDREW DUDLEY.

"Trusty cousin and hearty friend. After most hearty commendations, may it please you I have received your writing the 16th day of December, at Douglas, and understand the same, thanking you greatly of your kind offers. And as anent my assurance, in this manner I have assured my kind friends and servants, because my bands is sae meikle, whose names could not be specified . . . . . praying you heartily, as my special trust is in you, to be good and friendful to my servants and friends, as Patie Lynn, James Anderson, and my servants of Arbroath, which no more I cannot specify unto you shortly. And as for my servants and friends, I shall use them as ye do. And as anent the siege of the King's Craig-house of Broughty, I was warned to the same by the queen's grace and the governor. I had business I shewed them, that I might not come. They sent special of the council to me, and offered me great rewards to come to the same. *I cause all my friends and servants to stop and remain*. . . . He could not make any more on this side the Firth, but sixty of honest men. And as long as he was at the siege, I had posts running daily forth of my lands of Hermitage, to see how you fared in all causes, and have my answers, the which I shall shew you at our meeting. And as anent the coming in the country, I should have been with you ere now, were not the coming of the Earl of Lennox in Scotland . . And I have appointed friends to convene the 18th day of this instant month, towards that matter, to set him forward in his affairs, the which shall be shortly, will God. And I [mean to] advertise my Lord of Lennox, with two of my honest friends, Glencairn, Cassillis, or Lord Boyd, or Creichton, of all purposes three days afore. This is the principal stop that holds me from you longer. Thereafter I shall be at you with diligence. Anything that you would advertise me of shortly, send it to Arbroath, and they will haste it to me. Thus, fare ye well, most heartily. At Douglas, the 18th of December.

"Your cousin,

"LORD EARL OF ANGUISH."[2]

[1] From a curious paper, published for the first time by Mr Stevenson, in his "Illustrations of the Reign of Queen Mary," p. 99, (from the Harleian MS. 289, fol. 73,) we learn that this intended invasion was stopt by the advice of Thomas Bishop, an adherent of Lennox, who, on good grounds, suspected that Douglas was acting treacherously.

"My device to him," [the Protector,] says Bishop, "and the Duke of Northumberland, at Shene, stopt my Lord Grey from entering Scotland with six thousand men, whereof the greatest force horsemen, being then the flower of England—his journey being devised by George Douglas, to have brought them to the butchery, as well was known after. The article [communication] to him in that matter at good length will declare."

[2] MS. Letters State-paper Office, December 18, 1547.

I have mentioned two other powerful noblemen as deserting the governor and embracing the English interest — the Earls of Huntly and Argyle. Huntly was a Roman Catholic; his possessions and power in the north were almost kingly; he had been taken prisoner at Pinkie, and was anxious to be permitted to return to Scotland on his parole. Argyle, on the other hand, was the great rival of Huntly in the north; he had escaped at Pinkie; he was a supporter of the Reformation, and one of the most able and ambitious men in Scotland. The Protector Somerset played the one against the other. Argyle, on the 25th December 1547, had come to St Johnston with an army of Highlandmen, thinking to annoy Dudley, the English governor of Broughty, and ravage the country, which had taken assurance of the English. Some time after this, he threatened to join the French in besieging Broughty,[1] and continued these hostile denunciations till the 5th of February 1547-8, when Sir Andrew Dudley addressed a letter to the protector, in which he informed him that, at the suit of Lord Gray, (of Scotland,) and other gentlemen of Angus, he had granted Argyle an assurance for twenty days for the whole country of Angus. There then follows this sentence:—"There were two assurances made between the Earl of Argyle and me, [Dudley:] the one *open* to the bishops and council, the other *secret* between Argyle, Gray, and me, to be a favourer of the king's godly purpose, and to take the king's majesty's part in the same; on which communing, the Lord Gray *borrowed one thousand crowns of me to give the Earl of Argyle, to make him the more earnest in the same*, as appeareth by a bill. . . . . sent your grace . . . . it shall please your grace . . to send some man shortly, with a commission and authority to commune with the Earl of Argyle. The Lord Gray *putteth no doubt but that, for a pension and a certain sum of money, your grace shall win him to the king's majesty's godly purpose, and to be an earnest setter forth of the same.*"[2]

On the 7th February 1547-8, Lord Gray (of Scotland) addressed a letter to the protector, in which he informed him that he had borrowed five hundred ryals, (one thousand crowns,) and had given them to Argyle, "for the good causes he had done to his grace's affairs." He adds, that a commissioner must be sent from England to treat with Argyle, who is "wonderfully given to favour the king's [Edward's] godly purpose."[3]

The commissioner sent to treat with Argyle was John Brende, muster-master of Berwick. On the 6th March 1547-8, Dudley informed the protector that the Scottish earl had come to Coupar, and that Lord Gray (of Scotland) had ridden with Mr Brende that morning to communicate with him there.[4] The result of this communication appears from a letter of Brende to the protector.[5] It states that, on the 6th of that month, he, with Lord Gray, met Argyle near St Johnston's. Brende thanked him for the good disposition which he had shewn to the purpose of the marriage. Argyle regretted the damage done by the war, and professed his willingness to work some mean for the redress thereof. Brende then wished to draw him on to make some proposal or some promise. This he warily declined, requesting him to shew what the protector required. Brende then proceeds thus:—"And when I was about to declare, he bad stay: 'I am held,' quoth he, 'in a marvellous jealousy; and there be,' he said, 'certain of the council mortal enemies to your part. I would, therefore,' quoth he, 'to colour the matter, ye should devise to speak somewhat openly to me, before them, of such matter as ye think good, which shall be a mean that, without suspicion, ye may treat *secretly* with me of such things as be of moment.' Then called he before him the Abbot of Coupar, the Lord called Stuard, Sir John Cammel, and divers others. 'This gentleman,' quoth he, 'hath commission to me; and, because it partly toucheth you, ye shall hear what he will say.'" Brende then proceeded to declare the purpose of the marriage, the opposition of evil men, and the cause of the war. "And thereupon," says he, "I plucked forth, and presented to the earl a parcel of my instructions, which I had drawn forth for that purpose, (nothing mentioning the Earl [Argyle] nor any proffer made unto him,) but only purporting a present contract of marriage, &c., the delivering

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Dudley to the Protector, 22d January 1547-8.

[2] Ibid., 5th February 1547-8.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Lord Gray to the Protector, 7th February 1547-8.

[4] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Dudley to the Protector, 6th March 1547-8.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 9th March 1547-8.

the castles of Edinburgh and Dunbar as pledges for the queen's entry into England, and the conditions of peace. When this was done, the earl somewhat spoke, 'how greatly fair means might prevail in this matter, and how much violence made against the purpose,' which words confirmed with a churme [murmur] of those that stood about; somewhat I did speak again to the purpose when violence should be used, and in what cases it was lawful for princes to use the sword. Then *did he draw me aside*, and allowed my device. 'Hereupon,' quoth he, '*we shall colour our treaty, and blind these wolves' eyes*,' *and willed me to proceed in my secret commission.*"

Brende then thanked him for his good disposition, and told him they knew he had the power, wherefore if good will were joined in him with power, there would be no further doubt of success. He (Brende) shewed the great advantages which would ensue, besides the honour to himself, "and so declared his reward for bringing it to pass,"—that is, for accomplishing the first point of his instructions, viz., the delivery of the queen. "'If all things," said he, [Argyle,] 'had chanced well, she had been in my hands ere this; for if after the battle [Pinkie] pursuit had been made, she had come into my country—and she wrote to me for the same purpose at the last entry of the Lord Grey. But now,' quoth he, 'she is in Dunbarton.' 'And you may easily come by her,' quoth I, 'or else devise how she may be had.' 'No,' said he, 'it is impossible; the castle is stark, [strong,] and if force could prevail, it were unfitting for me to enforce my natural lady.' . . . After great persuasion, he agreed with me upon that point, like as it may appear unto your grace by the paper of articles subscribed with his hand, and sealed with his seal, sent herewith unto your grace. And because his resolution therein was not to the full effect of my instructions, I took advantage of his promise therein, and passed to the . . .

"2nd point, which he liked well, (except the authority of the priests, not provided for in the articles,) saying, 'he would pass to the court, and persuade the governor and the queen immediately to send ambassadors for the accomplishment of it.' 'And if,' quoth I, 'they will not agree to your request, what will ye do then?' 'What would you I should do?' quoth he. Then I plucked forth a paper of the third degree, as I had them all four severally written, touching the *taking of open part* with the king's majesty, and shewed it him. He required to have it, that he might read it, and examine it with himself.

"When he had put the same in his bosom, we fell in the rehearsal of divers things; and, knowing of a certain envy between the Earl of Huntly and him, I took occasion to talk of the said earl. When he heard him named he started, and beating his fist upon the board, said, 'If ye let him home, ye mar all.' Whereupon I took occasion. 'My lord,' quoth I, 'therefore it behoveth you to take this matter on hand; for if you will not, he may perchance be so persuaded that he himself will enterprise this thing,' which words —— moved him marvellous much, and he said, 'Marry! I will do it indeed.'—Then proceeded I, 'If the governor will still see the ruin of the country, and still stand on the contrary part, what shall become of him?' 'No governor,' quoth he. 'Who, then,' quoth I, 'is so meet as your lordship?' 'I think,' quoth he, 'I have most friends and power.' 'If, then," quoth I, 'we have the favour and power of England joined thereunto, who shall withstand you?' 'It is true,' quoth he. Finally, he condescended to the third article, in this effect: — That if the queen and the governor would not agree to these covenants, then would he straightway repair to Argyle, there call all his friends about him, declare to them his mind, and require them to take his part in this purpose, and then to send one unto your grace, to conclude upon certain points of his proceeding before he do further. . . . I perceive he would covenant to have aid against his enemies in the north by sea, and require that the Earl of Lennox should have no power on his lands in the west parts. When I saw he had thus condescended, I did not touch the fourth degree, otherwise than that he should lett [hinder] the conveyance away of the queen."

Brende then promised him an assurance for his country for fifteen days. At first Argyle would not subscribe, or set his seal to the agreements which Brende had drawn. The English envoy then broke off; but late in the night, when all were in bed, he sent Lord Gray to urge Argyle, "and finally, after four or five times going and coming betwixt us in the dead time of night, he at

last was brought to such case, that in the morning he signed." Argyle's character, as given by Brende, is this:—"I have heard him reported to be much constant. I found him humane, wise, and grave, in whom I could have believed all things that he said, if I had not determined in them to trust nothing at all. I judge him greedy of gear, desirous of authority, . . . and therefore moved unto this by the envy he beareth to the governor, and the emulation he hath with the Earl of Huntly, which will be ever of the contrary part to him; therefore, the matter, in my opinion, consisteth in this point,—whether your grace's purpose may take better effect in letting the Earl of Huntly home, so as to raise factions betwixt them, or else by detaining him, to have the Earl of Argyle wholly in that part, if so be he will stand unto his promise." The letter which contains the above interesting details is dated Warkworth, 9th March 1547-8, and signed JOHN BRENDE.

Notwithstanding the promise to Argyle, the protector entered into a secret agreement with the Earl of Huntly, who engaged, if allowed to return home, to embrace the English faction, and further the king's (Edward VI.) majesty's affairs. This appears from the following letter of Huntly to the protector, dated Newcastle, 20th March 1547-8:[1]—

THE EARL OF HUNTLY TO THE PROTECTOR.

"MY LORD,—After most humble commendations of service unto your grace, it pleases you to wit: We arrived at Newcastle, 18th, and has heard no word of Scotland yet, except a man of mine who came with my Lord Gray, lieutenant, and met me by the way. My said Lord Gray has informed you how all . . . passes in Scotland, better nor I can presently. My lord, I am credibly advertised that our governor repents that our mistress is past to Dunbarton, and is labouring to bring her grace again to . . [Stirling] which is promised to him, how soon her grace bees whole in person. She has been very sick in the small-pox, and not yet whole. My Lord Governor, as I am advertised, will be brought . . . . . I lyppenyt [trust] to get hasty word by his grace of the same; and, if commissioners shall come to the Borders for end of all these affairs, may it please your grace to shew my Lord Gray who shall meet with them, and of your grace's mind in that behalf. Your grace shall be sure of such service as I may do, to the furthering of the king's majesty's affairs, in all sorts as your grace will command, as my duty is . . . . . shall shortly know indeed, and shall . . . to him, as I can get intelligence, not doubting . . . the best part, and favour the peace better nor . . . and your grace's purpose; which I pray God send to the weal and union of both the realms that have so long been at discord. And further, your grace may command me, and, in what place I may do best service, shall be aye ready at your grace's charge. My lord, I am not able to give your good grace most humble thanks for the great goodness and humanity shewn to me, who have ever yet deserved the contrar; albeit, gif it be in me possible, I shall make such amends as my wit or power may serve. My lord, I pray the living God have ever your grace in his tuition—at the New Castle, the 20th day of March.

"Your grace's humble
servant at power."

The signature of this letter, some words of which are illegible, is gone, but there is a contemporary docquet on the back, "xx March. Th' Erle of Huntly to my L. P."

It is stated at p. 65, that in the enterprise or invasion of the Lord Wharton, on 18th February 1547-8, the Earl of Lennox commanded the Scottish Borderers in the service of Edward VI. The result of this disastrous expedition is given in the text; but the following letter of Lennox, addressed to the Protector Somerset after his return, will convince the reader of the calm treachery with which this Scottish nobleman could talk of the *king's majesty's* (Edward VI.) *possessions in the west* parts of Scotland.

EARL OF LENNOX TO THE LORD PROTECTOR.[2]

"Pleased your most noble grace to be advertised that, whereupon my suit, it pleased your grace to be so much my good lord, to grant my entry into Scotland, for the service of the king's majesty, with such Scottish men as be lately come to his highness's devotion, for the which I most humbly thank your grace, according to the same; and

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office.

[2] State-paper Office, original, 26th December 1547, Castle of Wrissel.

at command of your grace's several letters to my Lord Wharton for that purpose, I entered, and by his lordship's advice, proceeded, as your grace hath been here before advertised. And of intent your grace should know more at large the order thereof, and also my repair again to Carlisle at your grace's pleasure, for the full accomplishment of such service as, for divers occasions, at this time could not have been done, my friend Thomas Bishop, the king's majesty's servant, is instructed to declare the same at length, to whom it will please your grace give firm credence. And by him would be most glad to know your grace's further pleasure and commandments, which I shall obediently, God willing, to the uttermost of my poor power accomplish.

"It will also please your grace to be advertised that there is a little abbacy, called Holywood, of a hundred pounds a year, now vacant, and within the precincts of *the king's majesty's possessions of the west parts of Scotland*, which the governor has given to the Sheriff of Ayr, as will appear by a letter, with other writs, sent to me of late forth of Scotland, which I send unto your grace herewith. I would most humbly beseech your grace, at my poor suit, to grant your grace's gift of the same to my cousin, the *Laird of Closeburn*, who serves the king's majesty very well, and is a man of power, for whose constancy and honesty in his highness's service, I will be bounden, and to my friend Thomas Bishop, whom with him he would were . . . . And, God willing, with your grace's aid and favour, the same shall be defended contrar the Sheriff of Ayr, or any others, enemies to the king's majesty in that realm. And thus prays Almighty God to preserve your grace in most long and prosperous life, with much increase of honour. At the king's majesty's castle of Wrissel, 16th Dec. 1547.

"Your grace's most humbly,
with his service,
"MATTHEW LENNOX."

LETTER F, page 67.

Arrival of the French.

As some obscurity hangs over the arrival of the French auxiliaries in Scotland, it will be useful to fix precisely the dates, which are not very clearly given either by Keith or by Robertson. The following abstract of a letter from Sir R. Bulmer to the protector marks the arrival of the first band of French, chiefly officers, to have been on the 25th December 1547:—

SIR RALPH BULMER TO THE PROTECTOR.

He sends his grace these news, which had been brought by the Lord of Cessford. "Christmas day last past, two French ships came to Dunbarton, there landed with fifty French captains, bringing money to wage ten thousand Scots for a year, which money is sent by the Bishop of Rome. There came *three* of the chief captains to Stirling, to the queen and the lords, on St Stephen's day at night, apparelled all in white satin, and told the queen and the council the cause of their coming. They shewed her there was six thousand Frenchmen on the sea for Scotland, waiting a wind. As soon as the ten thousand Scots are mustered, and these six thousand are landed, *then* a post is to be sent to the French king, who had an army in readiness to land in England, and a fleet of ships is also promised by Denmark, but this not so certain." The letter concludes by advising his grace to grant power to the Lord of Cessford to collect the rents of Mernis, for two reasons —"1st, It will be most for the king's benefit; 2d, It will set Buccleuch and Cessford at variance, which were a good policy; for *although Buccleuch had taken assurance, yet he was playing a double part*, assuring the queen and governor that he is yet a true Scotsman."[1]

We learn by a letter from Lord Wharton to Somerset,[2] that Monsieur de la Chapelle was the leader of these Frenchmen, which proves the accuracy of De Thou, book v. c. 15, vol. i. p. 189. Buckly edit.

By another letter from Lord Grey to the protector, dated at Berwick, June 17, 1548,[3] it appears that the second arrival of auxiliaries, conducted by Monsieur D'Essé, must have been June 15th or 16th, 1548. This was the great force, including Suisses and Almains, as well as French. Lord Grey diminishes their number to twelve hundred men-at-arms and eight hundred light horsemen; but they were at the least six thousand strong, as is proved by a letter, State-paper Office, Lord Wharton to the Protector, dated 14th July 1548.

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 30th December 1547. Sir R. Bulmer to the protector.

[2] MS. State-paper Office, B. C., 1st January 1547-8.

[3] MS. State-paper Office.

Letter G, page 68.

Embarkation of the young Queen for France.

Neither Keith, p. 55, nor Chalmers, p. 10, are able to fix the exact time of the young queen's sailing for France. A letter in the State-paper Office, from Lord Grey to the protector, which is dated August 4, 1548, mentions that he is informed the young queen is not yet transported, but lieth in a galley, accompanied with other galleys and four or five ships, a little from Dunbarton, where, he adds, she undoubtedly was *yesterday*, at twelve of the clock at noon. And he continues, "the Lady Fleming, her mistress, making request to the captain of the galley, whose name is Villegaigno, to have her on land to repose her, because she hath been long on the sea; *he answered, she should not come on land, but rather go into France, or else drown by the way.*" Grey advises the protector to fit out some ships that way, with the hope of meeting her.

In the Egerton Collection of MSS. No. 2, preserved in the British Museum, the contents of which are inaccessible to the public from the want of catalogues, there is a volume of transcripts, from original letters during the reign of Henry the Second of France. My attention was directed to it by my learned friend Mr Holmes of the British Museum, who pointed out the following passages. In the first of them Henry the Second, writing to Monsieur de Humyeres, the governor of his children, who were then brought up at the Palace of St Germain-en-Laye, informs him (on the 27th July 1548) that the little queen of Scotland may soon be expected there, to be educated with the dauphin and his other children.

"Mais pour cela je ne veulx que vous bougez avec mes enfans, attendu maintenant que ma fille la petite Royne d'Escosse y pourra lors ou plustot arriver pour y estre nourrie avec eulx."[1]

In another letter from the king to Monsieur de Humyeres, he sends the dauphin and the young Queen of Scots a dancing master, Paul de Rege, to whom he gives a high character. The letter is dated 10th January 1549.

"Mon Cousin. Pour ce que Paule de Rege present porteur est fort bien balladin, et à ce que j'en y peu coagnoistre honneste et bien conditionnée, j'ay advisé de le donner à mons filz le Dauphin pour luy monster à baller, et pareillment à ma fille la Royne d'Escosse et aux jeunes gentilhommes et damoiselles estant à leur service, et de mes autres enfans; 'à ceste cause vous le presenterez à mon filz, et le ferez loger et manger avec ses autres officiers.'"

[1] 27th July 1548.

Letter H, page 69.

Ferocity of the War.

"The war assumed a character of more than common ferocity."—In addition to what is mentioned in the text, this fact is strikingly illustrated by a paper[2] entitled, "Memorial (it should rather be scroll of a memorial) for Edward Atkinson, *alias* Bluemantle, sent by the protector to the Governor of Scotland. This document states that, after having obtained audience, the said Bluemantle, putting on his coat of arms, and making reverence unto him, (the governor,) without any other salutation, shall boldly say as ensueth. The substance is that, understanding that sundry the king's majesty *his grace's sovereign lord's subjects and servants, born within the realm of Scotland*, have now a good while, and yet do, according to their bounden duty, serve his majesty in these wars—the governor had published a proclamation, commanding that if any Scotsmen so serving shall be taken in the field bearing arms against him, they shall not be used as prisoners, but immediately put to death as rebels. Bluemantle is enjoined to demand this proclamation to be immediately recalled, otherwise "all Scottish prisoners, of whatever rank they be, shall be put to death as soon as they are taken." This paper is followed by a "Minute of a Proclamation for not taking of Scottishmen," dated 22d May 1549. It commences thus:—"Edward by the Grace of God, &c. . . Whereas the Earl of Arran, *pretending himself to be Governor of Scotland*," and goes on to speak of the people of Scotland not acknowledging, or giving obedience to "their *superior and sovereign lord the king's majesty of England*, in consequence of which the countries are at war, and Scotland grievously afflicted with slaughter and devastation, as with a just plague of God." It then proceeds thus—"Not content with all this, the governor hath devised a most cruel, unnatural, and

[2] MS. State-paper Office, 19th May 1549.

deadly proclamation, that every Scotsman serving the king of England should be slain as soon as taken, by means of which some of his majesty's subjects, Scotsmen born, have been put to open and cruel death:" therefore, it continues, "that cruelty may be punished and repelled with cruelty," he, the protector, "straitly commands all his highness's wardens, deputy-wardens, officers, &c., that they do not from henceforth take any Scotsmen serving against *his highness in the field, but do kill the same out of hand without ransoming them*, until the Governor Arran have revoked his proclamation, under penalty of death, if this is disobeyed."

LETTER I, page 70.

Arrival of the Queen-dowager in France.

The exact date of this princess's arrival in France has not been given by any of our historians.

In an original letter of Anne de Montmorency, constable of France, to Mr de Bassefontaine, ambassador to the Queen of Hungary, (for the knowledge of which I am indebted to Mr Holmes of the British Museum,) there is the following notice of the arrival of the queen-dowager in France. The letter is in the British Museum. Additional MSS. 10,012, and is dated 27th September 1550:—

"Je vous advise que la Royne d'Escosse est puis trois ou quatre jours arrivée au Havre de Grace en bonne sante et tresbonne compagnie; elle fit hier son entrée à Rouen. En dimanche prochain viendra trouver le Roy à l'Abbaye de bonnes nouvelles, où il va demain coucher poure faire sa Feste St Michael; apres que les seigneurs, l'aura venu et parlé á elle, on vous fera entendre (ce que) sera requis sur les propos qui ont este entamez touchant la fait d'Escosse."

LETTER K, page 71.

Sir John Mason's Correspondence.

Some interesting particulars, illustrating the intrigues of the queen-dowager in France, a subject hitherto slightly passed over by our historians, may be derived from a volume in the State-paper Office, containing the correspondence of Sir John Mason, the English ambassador at the court of France. Its authenticity is unquestionable, as it is Sir John's own Letter-book.

We learn, by a letter from Mason to the Privy-council, dated Rouen, 6th October, [Correspondence, p. 118,] that he had that day visited the Queen-dowager of Scotland, who arrived there on the 25th of September, accompanied by a numerous train of Scottish gentlemen, and was received with much honour.

On the 19th of the same month and year, (1550,) Mason addressed a letter to the Privy-council, dated Dieppe. He observes that, since their coming, the principal of the Scots had visited him, except the Earl of Huntly and George Douglas. "They lamented their estate, and shewed why we [the English] had not our desire, [the king's marriage to Queen Mary,] which was 'the rude handling of them at all times, and especially in the notable slaughter made upon them at the great battle, [Pinkie.]'" He then continues, "I gave ear unto them as unto Scots, and framed mine answers accordingly, and told them that they had refused that, that I did not doubt but, within a short time, they would wish they had taken—we sought their own honour, profit, and commodity, which, forasmuch as they would not embrace, they were like to drink such as themselves had brewed, who had lively played the part of the horse that Æsop, in his fables, telleth sought the help of man against the hart. The Earl of Glencairn much complaineth of the detaining of his two sons, his father being dead, for whom they were pledges, but specially of the ill-handling of them by the archbishop, who, he saith, kept them two years in his kitchen."

I shall subjoin a few brief abstracts of some important letters addressed by the same ambassador to the Privy-council. They throw considerable light on the relative politics of France, England, and Scotland at this period.

In a letter, dated Blois, 4th December 1550, he remarks, that "the Scots bear a fell rout in this court, and be much made of, of all estates." He proceeds to say that, "whatever differences of opinion they might have on other points, on one they all agreed—viz., that the English shall not have one foot of ground in Scotland peaceably, more than we had before the wars, but they will have the thanks for it all together, if we like, and not forego it by piecemeal. *Ireland*," he adds, "is ready to revolt and deliver themselves to a new master on a moment's warning."[1]

[1] Mason to the Privy-council, 4th December 1550. Blois.

In a subsequent letter, dated Blois, 7th February 1550–1, he states that the blind Scot, named the Bishop of Armagh, who had lately been in Ireland with commission to make a stir among the people, passed five or six days ago by this court, and had been much made of,—adding, he was departed to Rome.

Again, on the 23d February 1550–1, writing to the council, he informs them that there were rumours of war secretly intended by France against England. England had refused a passport to the Master of Maxwell, at which the French king was much incensed, exclaiming, "Vraiment, voyez ci une pauvre vengeance." "There is in these men no love." "The Queen of Scots and her house beareth in this court the whole swing. . . . The queen-dowager desireth the subversion of England, 'whose service in Scotland is so highly taken here, as she is in this court made a goddess.' These men, the French, are in great readiness for the wars."

In a letter of the Lords of the Privy-council to Mason, dated at Greenwich, the 28th of January 1550, it appears that a spy had been sent, whom Balnaves the Scot recommended as proper to be trusted, and who would take care to bring the English ambassador as much intelligence as the Scots have.[1] In Sir John Mason's answer to the Privy-council, dated Blois, 26th February 1550–1, he informs them that this bearer arrived on the 24th February, but dared not tarry, as he found himself likely to be waylaid. He, however, had one who would fill his place—viz., the Lord Grange. "I talked with him," says Mason, "of the queen's departing, and of the men-of-war she was said to have with her." He said, "this would not take any effect this year. He [Grange] promised to communicate everything he could learn to the English ambassador, who, when he speaks of him, is to call him Corax."[2] By a letter of Mason to the Privy-council, 23d March 1551, dated at Blois, it appears that the Vidame of Chartres was at that time in Edinburgh, on a mission from France. In another letter of the 18th April 1551, from the same to the same, it is stated that one George Paris had arrived from Ireland. "He brags much," says Mason, "associates with the Scots, and has offers from the Irish to league with France and throw off England. He hopes to have the dauphin shortly proclaimed King of Scotland and Ireland. It is said they are to have no open assistance from France, but that the Queen of Scotland laboureth to have them holpen underhand by means of the Earl of Argyle and James Kennalt, [Macconnell.]" He goes on to observe that "John a Barton had arrived from Scotland at the French court, and brought word that the governor [Arran] had a great party in his favour to keep him in his place till they should have a king. This," he adds, "was ill taken by the queen-dowager, who was determined either to have the government herself, or to set a Frenchman of her house in it. Corax [Grange] thinks if the meeting of the commissioners for the Borders goes on smoothly, all things will be quiet for this year.'

The Earl of Huntly had obtained one part of his suit from the Queen of Scots, which was that, when she came of age, he should have the earldom of Moray. "This king [the King of France] hath bound himself by writing thereunto, but the custody of the bond is to be in the hands of the dowager. All the Scots are against him in this, especially Sutherland and Cassillis. It will breed a great stab amongst them."—"The queen is all for herself, and for a few other friends, whose partiality, shewed more to some than others, maketh a great heartburning. Lord Maxwell, at his departing, had a chain of five hundred crowns; Drumlanrick had nothing, and used rude speech to the queen.

"The Scottish queen's shipping is hasted very much. It is thought she shall embark a month sooner than she intended. The Lady Fleming departed hence, with child by this king.[3] And it is thought that immediately upon the arrival of the dowager in Scotland, she will come again to fetch another. If she so do, here is like to be a combat, being the heartburning already very great; the old worn pelf[4] fearing

[1] Mason, p. 250. Lords of Privy-council to Mason, Greenwich, 28th January 1550, Ibid., p. 251.

[2] Sir J. M. to Privy-council, Blois, 26th February 1550-1.

[3] This was, I suspect, the Dowager Lady Fleming, a daughter of James IV. by the Countess of Bothwell.—Douglas' Peerage, p. 698.

[4] The "old pelf" was the king's mistress, Diana of Poictiers, a woman at this time of fifty-three years.—Mezeray, p. 623.

thereby to lose some part of her credit, who presently reigneth alone and governeth without empeasche."

We learn something of the French intrigues in Ireland by a letter of Mason to the Privy-council, dated at Amboise, 22d April 1551.

He states, "that a gentleman who had come from Ireland with George Paris was named Cormac Ochonor, eldest of nine brothers who are alive. He braggeth his father hath been the great worker of all this rebellion. He never would submit to England, although he hath a house within a stone's cast of the English pale. Last Saturday, he exhibited to the constable a paper, shewing what force, both horse and foot, his father could bring into the field; asked for prompt assistance, as it was by the French intrigues this rebellion had wholly been stirred up. He begged for five thousand men at the French king's charges. He was paid with fair words. *The Dowager of Scotland would fain have them holpen*, and I am assuredly informed the Vidame is nothing behind them, who, since his coming hither, hath been very highly and friendly entertained by the king. He hath had many secret conferences with the king, the dowager, and the constable." The Vidame had come from a mission into Scotland. By another letter, dated 27th April 1551, it appears "that the Scottish queen's departure . . . . was again delayed, and some thought the occasion thereof was some fancy the French king hath to some of her train."[1]

In his next letter, 29th April 1551, at Amboise, Sir John Mason informed the English Privy-council that he had made diligent search as to the news brought by a post from Scotland. "I have learned," says he, "that there is come to light a practice (or at the least a great suspicion thereof) for the poisoning of the young queen. He that took the matter upon him is an archer of the guard, who is escaped into Ireland. There is as much diligence made as can be devised for the getting of him from thence; and, as they say here, he is already stayed to be sent back again to Scotland, and so into France. The old queen is fallen suddenly sick upon the opening of this news unto her. By whose means this thing should principally be moved I cannot yet understand, but it is thought that it was devised by some miscontented Scots. This is told me for a great secrecy; whether it be true or not your Lordships may know farther with time. . . . The said post hath brought word that the Lady Fleming is brought to bed of a man child, whereat our women do not much rejoice."[2]

On the 10th May 1551, Sir John Mason, writing from court to the English Privy-council, observes, "There hath been lately a great consultation touching the marriage of the dauphin to the Scottish queen, which the constable and the chancellor would in any case to be deferred." "The Dowager of Scotland maketh all at this court weary, from the high to the low—such an importunate beggar is she for herself. The king would fain be rid of her, and she, as she pretendeth, would fain be gone. Marry, the hucking is about many matters, the king being desirous she should depart upon promise of the sending thereof to her, and she desiring to have the same with her. The sums are two hundred thousand francs of old debts, which is in a manner all paid; and, besides that, fifty thousand francs more, partly for the payment of other pensions accorded among the Scots, and partly to remain at her disposition as she shall see cause, and fifty thousand for her own pension for that year. Talking yesterday with the Receiver-general of Bretagne of Scottish matters, he told me—wishing that Scotland were in a fish-pool—that, out of his receipt and of the receipt of Guienne, there had been sent thither since the beginning of the wars nineteen hundred thousand francs —how much had passed otherwise he knew not," (p. 312.) On the 19th May, Mason alludes to the French intrigues in Ireland. . . "I saw," says he, "yesterday a letter sent from Rome to an Italian in this court, wherein was written that the Bishop of Armachan, as he calleth himself, which is the blind Scot that lately passed this way, is thoroughly and very well despatched touching the matters of Ireland." It appears, by a subsequent letter of June 11, that the "blind Scot," the Bishop of Armagh, had departed with his despatch towards Ireland. The last letter in this valuable volume of Sir John Mason's Correspondence is dated July 20, 1551.

Sir William Pickering, and soon after him Sir Nicholas Wotten, succeeded

[1] Mason to the Privy-council, 27th April 1551. Amboise.

[2] Mason to the Privy-council, p. 309, May 10, 1551.—From court.

Mason as ambassadors at the French court, and their letters, which are preserved in the French Correspondence of the State-paper Office, vol. vi., contain many interesting illustrations, not only of the politics of France and England, but of the condition of Scotland and of Ireland during the last years of Edward and the commencement of the reign of Mary. Indeed, I might rather say, they illustrate the history of Europe; for it was the business of the English ambassador at the court of France to have his agents or spies in Spain, Italy, and the Netherlands, and to transmit to the sovereign, the prime minister, and the Privy-council of England, reports of all the information which he received.

Mary of Guise's interview with Edward the Sixth took place on the 4th of November 1551, and she appears to have returned to Scotland about the 24th of the same month, as, in the books of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland, under the date 21st November 1551, we find an order directed to Sir Andrew Ker of Littledean, directing him to send letters of proclamation to Jedburgh, Selkirk, Dunse, &c., charging the lords, lairds, and other gentlemen to meet the queen at our Lady Kirk of Steil, in their most honest manner, on the 24th November.

In a letter dated September 19, 1552, preserved in the French Correspondence, we find a paper, entitled "Secret Information of Thomas Stukely," which details "a plan of the French king for the conquest of England."—First, he would order that the Scots should enter into Northumberland with all their power; then, he himself would come to Falmouth, and the Duke of Guise with another army to land at Dartmouth. He would proclaim and restore the old mass, putting the people to their full liberty as he doth in Scotland.

In a letter from Sir N. Wotten to the Privy-council, dated at Melun, 28th December 1553, he informs them that the report of the Queen of England's marriage with the Prince of Spain made the French begin to speak of war with England; and he adds, that the French king had already despatched Monsieur D'Osell with the same commission that he had on his former mission, and that he meant to send after him the Vidame of Chartres, with a certain number of soldiers.

We find by a letter of Wotten's to the council, Melun, January 9, 1553-4, that the Queen of Scots now kept her table and lodging apart, to shew that she had come to her years to have the whole rule in her own hands.

I shall conclude these short notices of the valuable matter which may be found in the French Correspondence of the State-paper Office, by the following letter of Wotten to the Lord Paget, privy-seal, and Sir William Petre, knight, principal secretary. It is dated 1st March 1556-7, and is written wholly in cipher, but fortunately the contemporary decipher accompanies it:—

"My duty remembered to your honours. I have heretofore certified the queen's majesty, what good will this bearer, Kirkaudrie, [Kirkaldy,] seemed to bear to her majesty, and to the realm of England, and how little he is contented with the present state of Scotland, and how desirous he is to see it delivered from the yoke of the Frenchmen, and restored to their former liberty; and also what offers he hath divers times made to serve the queen's majesty the best he could. Whereupon, although I have had no answer, yet forasmuch as he returneth now into Scotland, and thereby hath occasion to pass through England, I advised him to do that thing which I perceived he was before of himself minded to do,—that is to say, to visit you by the way, thereby you may, by communication with him, the better understand his mind; . . and, in case you like him, appoint him how he is to serve. Marry, this he earnestly requireth, that in case the queen's highness shall think him meet to do her majesty's service, that yet, nevertheless, his matters may pass only through your hands, for he feareth greatly that, all the council being privy to it, it were not easy to be kept secret, thereby he should stand in danger of his life.

"Now, in case you should ask me what I think of him, first I must say, that I have had no acquaintance with him, but sith my coming hither. Marry, by the communication I have had with him now and then here, either he must be a very great and crafty dissembler, or else he beareth no good will at all to the Frenchmen, and, next unto his own country, he beareth a good mind to England.

"Marry, what service he shall be able to do now, he intending to continue in Scotland, your wisdoms can better consider than I. For, because I trust he

will declare at length unto you of the return of his father and of Balnaves into Scotland, and for what purpose it is thought they are revoked; and also, that Melvin, who accused the Bishop of Durham, is come hither, recommended to the French king by the Dowager of Scotland's letters; and of the arrival of the four Scottish bands of horsemen, and of a plott [plan] of Berwick, which the French king hath, howsomever he came by it; and how these men are nothing sorry for the Earl of Douglas's death; and of a Scottish physician married in London, named Durham, as I remember, who is a spy for the French king and the Dowager of Scotland, and hath a pension of her, three hundred crowns by the year, therefor; and how ill the Bishop of St Andrews can away with the Frenchmen in Scotland; and also, of the arrival of one of the Landgrave of Hesse's sons into the court here, and how he is made of, and how sorry they were here for Marquis Albert's death; and generally of such news as are spoken of here in the court: I shall, therefore, the less need to unite them at this time, but making here an end, &c. &c.

"Paris, 1st March 1556-7."

In the following passage, which occurs in a letter of Wotten to the queen, I find the first notice of the afterwards active and intriguing Randolph.

"Postcripta. I have received," says he, "a letter from a scholar of Paris, named Thomas Randall, who writeth thus—'Thomas Stafford took his ship on Easter-day, at night. There are gone with him more French than of our nation. He went in the Flower de Luce, whereof is captain John Rybande, and another ship with him laden with artillery.' Thus far writeth the said Randall. . . The voice is at Dieppe that they go into Scotland, which I believe not well."

We see here how soon Randolph began to shew his talents as a diplomatic spy.

LETTER L, page 73.

Cardan and the Bishop of St Andrews.

This celebrated and eccentric physician, who was brought to Scotland to cure the Scottish primate, gives us a few particulars of his journey in his amusing work, "De Vita Propria." Unfortunately he is very brief, and more communicative on the extent of his fees than the state of the country. He calls the primate Amulthon, (Hamilton,) and declares that, after his case (a kind of periodic asthma) had defied the skill of the physicians of the emperor and the French king, he made the bishop smack whole in twenty-four hours. "Intra xxiv. horas nullo vel plane levi remedio liberabatur." He came to Edinburgh on the 3d of June, and remained till the 13th of September. He returned to Italy January 1523.

His mode of cure, as described by Randolph in the following extract from one of his letters to Cecil,[1] was not quite so simple as Cardan himself would have us believe. He sinks the "young whelps, and hanging the poor prelate by the heels."

"I will be bold," says Randolph, "to trouble your honour a little with a merry tale:—Cardanus, the Italian, took upon him the cure of the Bishop of St Andrews, in a disease that, to all other men, was judged desperate and incurable. He practised upon him divers foreign inventions. He hung him certain hours in the day by the heels, to cause him to avoid at the mouth that the other ways nature could not expel; he fed him many days with young whelps; he used him sometimes with extreme heats, and as many days with extreme colds. Before his departure, he roundeth, for the space of six days, every day, certain unknown words in his ears, and never used other medicine after. It is said that at that time he did put a devil within him, for that since that he hath been ever the better, and that this devil was given him on credit but for nine years, so that now the time is near expired that either he must go to hell with his devil or fall again into his old mischief, to poison the whole country with his false practices."

[1] MS. State-paper Office, 15th Jan. 1561-2.

PROOFS AND ILLUSTRATIONS

FROM

MANUSCRIPTS, CHIEFLY IN HER MAJESTY'S STATE-PAPER OFFICE, HITHERTO UNPRINTED.

No. I., page 78.

Power and Licence of the Nobles in Scotland.

In England, during the reigns of Henry the Eighth, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, the power of the sovereign over the nobles, and the influence of the wishes of the crown, was infinitely greater than in Scotland, during the same period. In Scotland, the nobles lived in what Sir Ralph Sadler denominates, in his despatches, "a beastly liberty." They reasoned and acted for themselves; they looked to the course which they thought promised best for the country, or for their own interest; and the idea of following this in opposition to the commands of the crown was familiar to them; nay, not only this, but they often contemplated the idea of compelling the sovereign to follow their wishes. The different feelings of the nobles in the two countries are strongly marked in the following letter of Mr Thomas Martyn to Mary Queen of England, dated at Carlisle, 11th June 1557.[1]

After alluding to their conferences on the Borders, he goes on to state a conversation between the Earls of Westmoreland and Cassillis, in these terms:—"My Lord of W. sayeth to th' Erle of Cassillis in this wise—'My Lord, I think it but folly for us to treat *now* together, we having broken with France, and ye being French for your lives.'—'Nay, by the messe,' quoth the Earl of Cassillis, 'I am no more French than you are a Spaniard.' 'Marry,' quoth my Lord of Westmoreland, 'as long as God shall preserve my master and mistress together, I am, and shall be a Spaniard, to the utmost of my power.'—'By God,' quoth the Earl of Cassillis, 'so shall not I be French: and I told ye once in my Lord your father's house, in King Henry the Eighth his time, that we would die, every mother's son of us, rather than be subjects until England: even the like will ye find us to keep with France; and I may tell you there are seven hundred Gascons arrived at Dumbryton, more than we will be known to you of, which were sent to serve in the Borders here; but we would not let them pass the river, and they, being allowed but three pence a-day, have so scattered abroad, that three hundred of them be licked up by the way: sic [such] is the favour that our men beareth unto the Frenchmen here. My Lord of Durham telleth me that the Bishop of Orkney ministered talk unto him to this effect, wishing in any wise restitution to be made of both parties equally, whereby the amity might be preserved betwixt us, notwithstanding the French. Mr Makgill told Mr Henmar there was no cause why they should break with us, though we broke with France, for the emperor's wars with the French empeacheth not our legal amity with the emperor. Likewise Mr Carnegy gave me his faith as a Christian man, and honour of a Scottish knight, that his mistress meant the like: marry, for saving his oath, he added at the end, as far as we yet ken.'"

[1] MS. State-paper Office.

No. II., page 78.

Coalition between the Lord James and the Queen-dowager.

Some new particulars regarding this coalition, mentioned in the text, may be gathered from a letter of Lord Wharton to the Lords of the Council.[2] It gives an account of a secret meeting which he had with William Kirkaldy of Grange.

"He (says Lord Wharton, alluding to Kirkaldy) saith, that the Prior of St Andrews, who is accounted the wisest of the late king's base sons, and one of the council of Scotland, the Earl of

[2] MS. State-paper Office, 14th Nov. 1557.

Glencairn, and the Bishop of Caithness, did agree to write the letters in the pacquet; and that the dowager is of council, and consenting therewith; and that she wrote her letters to Mr D'Osell, to cause Kirkaldy make devise to send the letters to me, that they might pass in haste; and that the dowager's letter did meet D'Osell beside Dunbar, towards Edinburgh, the 13th of this month. D'Osell returned [sent back] Kirkaldy, upon the sight of the dowager's letter, with the pacquet forthwith, who saith to me, it is the queen and D'Osell's device, and D'Osell very earnest therewith, with many words that he hath given to Kirkaldy of the great displeasure that the queen and D'Osell beareth, especially against the Duke Chastelherault and the Earl of Huntly, and against others whom D'Osell nameth the feeble and false noblemen of Scotland. Amongst others, he said, when their army retired, and their ordnance was to be carried on the water, D'Osell sent word to the Duke that he would see the ordnance returned over the water again, and that it might be put in safety. The messengers said to the Duke that D'Osell was angry with their retire, and breach of their promise, and also not regarding the safety of their ordnance. The Duke's answer was, 'Let Monsieur D'Osell gang by his mind an he will; for as we, the noblemen of Scotland, have determined and written to the queen, so will we do, and let him look to his own charge:' and so was D'Osell left. Upon which words, and their manner of dealing, D'Osell will seek their displeasure by all the ways and means he can, and so will the dowager do also, as Kirkaldy saith.

"In talk with him, I said it was a great matter to enterprise to bring into that realm my Lady Margaret Lennox, and my Lord her husband—that it required power of noblemen, with others, and houses of strength. He said, the coming of my lady to the dowager, with their friends there, would order that matter, and said, they might first have the castle of Tantallon, which is in the keeping of the Laird of Craigmillar, and at the dowager's order. He speaketh liberally that they would have many friends, and also have on their side the authority that now is. This matter, as I think in my poor opinion, may be wrought for my Lady Margaret and my Lord of Lennox, and to continue the displeasure now standing amongst the greatest of that realm."

Kirkaldy goes on to propose a truce, as introductory to a peace. Wharton answered, the Scots only pretended an anxiety for a truce when it suited themselves, and broke it when they pleased; but, should it be entertained, whom would he propose to send? Kirkaldy said, the Lord Seton, Captain Sarlabarosse, who had been one before, the Laird of Craigmillar, and the young Laird of Lethington, or two of them. These are the dowager's, and great with her. He said, Scotland would agree to an abstinence for twenty days or for two months, but they must have a licence for an especial man to pass through England, and communicate with the French king. Wharton asked the news. He said, on Sunday last, 7th November, arrived a ship at Leith, with letters and money from the French king. He had seen a letter from the French king to D'Osell, in which it was said he should have all his desires of men and money. That four ensigns, twelve hundred foot, and two hundred horse, were despatched to come into Scotland by the West Seas, and daily looked for.

It is not unimportant to notice, (on account of the light it throws on the character of the Lord James, afterwards the Regent Moray,) that we here find him, Kirkaldy of Grange, Glencairn, and the Bishop of Caithness, acting with the queen-dowager against Huntly, Chastelherault, and Argyle. We find them receiving money from the French king, and stipulating for the presence of a French army in Scotland. Kirkaldy has generally been represented as a mirror of chivalry, — consistency certainly was not his forte. In a letter of Wotton, (see supra, p. 386,) dated 1st March 1556-7, he is determined on putting down all French influence in Scotland; here we find him, nine months after, inviting a French army into that country, and subsequently, in 1559, he returned to his first opinion. (See this volume, p. 97.)

No. III.

Letters and Papers of Knox.

Not a few original letters of Knox are preserved in the State-paper Office, besides various public papers in his handwriting, and evidently his composition. Of these, some appear in his History, but often very incorrectly printed, many

words being altered, and parts entirely omitted. Others are to be found in the MS. Calderwood, in the British Museum. The letter quoted p. 100, and addressed to Percy, dated 1st July 1559, which has not been printed, commences thus:—

"The mighty comfort of the Holy Ghost for salutation. Right honourable, having the opportunity of this bearer unsuspect, I thought good to require of you such friendship, as that, from time to time, conference and knowledge might be betwixt us; I mean not myself and you, but betwixt the faithful of both these realms, to the end that inconveniences pretended against both, may, by God's grace and mighty power, be avoided. Your faithful friend, Mr Kirkaldy, hath reported to me your gentle behaviour and faithful fidelity in all things lawful, honest, and godly. Continue this, and God, by you, shall work more than now appeareth." Then follows the sentence quoted in this vol., p. 100, after which he concludes in these words: "But all this had I rather communicate face to face, than commit to paper and ink. This other letter I have direct to Mr Secretary, which, if your honour will cause to be delivered, I suppose you shall not offend him. Other things I have, which now I cannot write for continual trouble hanging on my wicked carcass, by reason of this tumult raised against Christ Jesus in His [infancy.] I pray you, seek to know the mind of the queen, and of the council, touching our support if we be pursued by an army of Frenchmen; and let me be assured by advertisement reasonably. And thus, committing you to the protection of the Omnipotent, I most heartily desire you to approve my love—enterprise—and enterprise not altogether without deliberation, as the troubles of these times do suffer.

"Yours to command
in godliness,
"JOHN KNOX."

"From Edinburgh the
1st of July 1559."

Knox's letter to Cecil, dated 12th July 1559, is preserved in the State-paper Office, in the original. It enclosed his celebrated apology to Elizabeth, and has been printed incorrectly, and in a garbled state, in his History, p. 224. The postscript of the same letter, which has not been printed, is as follows:—

"After the scribbling of these former lines, came Mr Whitlaw, of whom, after conference, I understood the match in which I have laboured ever since the death of King Edward, now to be opened unto you: God grant you and others wisdom with humility. Immediately after Mr Whitlaw, came a servant from Sir Harry Percy to Mr Kirkaldy, who, departing from us at Edinburgh to speak the said Sir Harry, brought news, to the hearts of all joyful, whensoever they shall be divulgat. It was thought expedient to communicate the matter only with those that are strongest, till farther knowledge of the queen's majesty's good mind towards this action. We doubt not the good mind of the whole Congregation, which is great, as I doubt not but by others you will understand; but it is not thought expedient that so weighty a matter be untimeously disclosed. True and faithful preachers in the north parts cannot but greatly advance this cause. If a learned and godly man might be appointed to Berwick, with licence also to preach within Scotland, I doubt not but to obtain unto him the hands of the most part of the gentlemen of the east Borders. Advert one thing, sir, that if the hearts of the Borderers of both parts can be united together in God's fear, our victory shall be easy. The fear of no man, I trust, this day to cause any of those that have professed themselves enemies to superstition within Scotland, to lift their hand against England, so long as it will abide in the purity of Christ's doctrine. Continual labours oppressing me, (most unable for the same,) I am compelled to end with imperfection. The source of all wisdom rule your heart to the end.

"So much I reverence your judgment, that I will ye first see my letter, or ye deliver it, and therefore I send it open. Read and present it, if ye think meet."

At the same time that the Lords of the Congregation addressed to Cecil the letter mentioned in the text, p. 101, as written and composed by Knox, the same indefatigable man prepared for them a letter to the queen. It is dated Edinburgh, 19th July 1559; and as it has never been printed, I subjoin it here from the original, in the State-paper Office, and in Knox's handwriting, and signed by the principal leaders of the Congregation:—

LORDS OF THE CONGREGATION TO QUEEN ELIZABETH.

"Right mighty, right high, and right excellent princess, with our most humill commendations unto your majesty. Albeit that heretofore divers men have wished, and as occasion hath offered, prudent men have devised, a perpetual amity betwixt the inhabitants of these our two realms; and yet that no good success hath to this day ensued of such travel and labours taken, yet cannot we, the professors of Christ Jesus in this realm of Scotland, cease to be suitors unto your grace, and unto your grace's well-advised council, to have eye to this our present estate. We have enterprised to enter in battle against the devil, against idolatry, and against that sort of men, who, before abusing, as well us as our princes, made us enemies to our friends, and the maintainers of strangers, of whom we now look [for] nothing but utter subversion of our commonwealth. If in this battle we shall be overthrown, (as that we stand in great danger, as well by domestical enemies, as by the great preparation which we hear to be sent against us by France,) we fear that our ruin shall be but an increase to a greater cruelty. And therefore we are compelled to seek remedy against such tyranny, by all such lawful means as God shall offer. And knowing your grace to have enterprised like reformation of religion, we could not cease to require and crave of your grace, of your council, subjects, and realm, such support, in this our present danger, as may to us be comfortable, and may declare your grace and council unfeignedly to thrust [thirst] the advancement of Christ Jesus, [and] of His glorious gospel: and whatsoever your grace and council can prudently devise, and reasonably require of us again for a perpetual amity to stand betwixt the two realms, shall, upon our parts, neither be denied, neither (God willing) in any point be violated, as at more length we have declared, in a letter written to your majesty's secretary, Mr Cecil.

"Right mighty, right high, and right excellent princess, we pray Almighty God to have your grace in His eternal tuition, and to grant you prosperous success in all your godly proceedings, to the glory of His name, and to the comfort of all those which earnestly thrust the increase of the kingdom of Christ Jesus.

"From Edinburgh the 19th of July,

"By your grace's most humble and faithful friends,

"ARCHD. ERGYLL.
"ALEXANDER GLENCAIRN.
"JAMES SANCTANDROS.
"PATRICK RUTHVEN.
"ROBERT BOYD.
"ANDRO OCHILTRE."

The proclamation, published by the Congregation on the 25th July 1559, alluded to in this volume, p. 103, is an important document, and has never been printed. It is as follows:—

"Apud Edinburgh, 25th July, Anno 1559.

"Forasmuch as the Lords of Congregation and Secret Council that has remained in this town (this sum time) bygane, are now to depart forth of the same, upon compromitt made betwixt them and the lords sent from the queen's grace regent, containing these heads: That no idolatry shall be erected where it is already suppressed. And that no member of the Congregation shall be troubled for religion, or any other cause dependent thereupon, in body, lands, or goods; and that their minister shall have full liberty, not only to preach, but also to ministrate the sacraments, publicly and privately as they think good, without trouble or impediment to be made to them by the queen, or any other, openly or quietly. And also that no band or bands of men of war, French, Scots, or others, shall be laid, nor remain within the town of Edinburgh. Therefore, the said Lords of Congregation has thought good to notify the said, by this present proclamation, to all whom effeirs, and especially to their brethren of the Congregation now within this town; certifiand them, and promising faithfully, if any of the foresaid points be violated or broken, that the said Lords of the Congregation will in that case fortify, concur, and assist, with their whole power and substance, as they have done in times bygane, to the reformation thereof, supporting of their brethren, relieving of every member of the true Congregation that shall be open to be invaded or molested, and to the furthering of God's glory, upon their honours, and as they will answer therefor in presence of Eternal God.

"Proclaimed by voice of trumpet at the market cross of Edinburgh, the day aforesaid."[1]

[1] This Paper, which is in the State-paper Office, is endorsed in Cecil's hand, 25th July,

Not only did the Lords of the Congregation, as stated in this volume, p. 106, address their remonstrances to Cecil, but Knox directed to the same minister a vigorous letter, dated at St Andrews, 15th August 1559. It is garbled and changed in his History, but the passages I have given in this volume, p. 108-9, are taken from the original in the State-paper Office. On the 23d of August 1559, he addressed the following letter to Sir James Crofts, under the fictitious name of John Sinclear. It is preserved in the State-paper Office, and endorsed, in Cecil's handwriting, "Mr Knox:"—

"Immediately upon the receipt of your letters, right worshipful, I despatched one to the Lords, from whom I doubt not ye shall receive answer according to your desire, with convenient expedition. The queen-regent here, as before I have written unto you, is marvellous busy in assembling all that she can. She hath addressed ordnance, and other munition, to Stirling. She hath corrupted, as is suspected, the Lord Erskine, captain of the castle of Edinburgh, and hopeth to receive it; but that will not so much hurt us as our enemies suppose, if all other things be prudently foreseen. She [breatheth] nothing but treason and revolt from her daughter's authority; but men begin to foresee somewhat more than they did not long ago. I wrote unto you before in favours of my [wife,] beseeching you yet eftsones to grant her free and ready passage; for my wicked carcass, now presently labouring in the fevers, needeth her service. I beseech you to grant unto the other man that cometh for my wife, passport to repair towards her for her better conducting. The spirit of all wisdom rule your heart, in the true fear of God to the end. From Londye, in Fife, the 23d of August 1559.

"Yours to power,
"JOHN SINCLEAR.
"In the midst of the exess. (exies.)[1]
"Read, write, and interpret all to the best."

No. IV., page 105.

Sir Ralph Sadler's Instructions.

These Instructions mentioned in this volume, are preserved in the State-paper Office, and are endorsed in Cecil's hand, "8th August 1559, Sir Ralff Saddler." They are important in the strong light they throw upon Elizabeth's policy towards Scotland; and, as they have not been printed, I subjoin them here:—

"MEMORIAL OF THINGS TO BE IMPARTED TO THE QUEEN'S MAJESTY — THE MATTER OF MR SADLER'S.

"First.—That he understand how the proceedings there differ from our intelligences here, and thereafter to proceed either the quicklier or the slower.

"Item.—The principal scope shall be to nourish the faction betwixt the Scots and the French, so that the French may be better occupied with them, and less busy with England. The means whereby may be those as follow, beside such as Mr Sadler of himself shall think meet. First, to provoke all such as have stirred in the last assembly, to require the queen-regent to perform her promise, both for restoring of religion, and sending away the Frenchmen, and to persuade them that, although they may be reconciled with promises or rewards, yet shall they never be trusted by the Frenchmen.

"Item.—To procure that the Duke may, for preservation of the expectant interest which he hath to the crown, if God call the young queen before she have issue, instantly withstand the governance of that realm by any other than by the blood of Scotland: like as the King of Spain, being husband to the Queen of England, committed no charge of any manner of office, spiritual or temporal, to any stranger, neither doth he otherwise, nor his father before him, in his countries of Flanders, Brabant, or any other, but suffereth them to be governed wholly by their own nation. In this point, if the Duke mean to preserve his title, ought he to be earnest; for otherwise he may be assured that the French, under pretence of subduing of religion, will also subdue the realm, and exstirpe his house.

"Item.—If this may be compassed, then may the nobility of Scotland also require of their queen, that, to avoid such mortal wars and bloodshed as hath been betwixt England and Scotland, there might be a perpetual peace made betwixt both these realms, so as no invasions should be made by either of them by their frontiers, and for the answer of an objection which may be made

apud Edinburgh. Proclamation of the Congregation.

[1] The exies—the ague; Jamieson's Supplement.

to disturb this purpose, it may be well said, that although the Scottish queen do falsely pretend title to the crown of England, yet doth she it but as descended from the blood of England—that is to say, of the body of King Henry the Seventh, whereunto none of Scotland either doth or can make pretence, and therefore none ought to be abused by any of such persuasion.

"Item.—The Duke may pretend as good cause to arrest Monsieur D'Oysell, or some other of the French, as for answering for his two sons, the earl and the L. David, as the French have done, in driving away the one and imprisoning the other, being neither of them his subjects nor offenders against him.

"Item.—It shall do well to explore the very truth whether the Lord James do mean any enterprise towards the crown of Scotland for himself or no; and if he do, and the Duke be found very cold in his own causes, it shall not be amiss to let the Lord James follow his own device therein, without dissuading or persuading him anything therein.

"Item.—Finally, if he shall find any disposition in any of them to rid away the French there, he may well accelerate the same, with this persuasion, that if they tarry until the aid come out of France, they shall find these to abide longer than they would."

No. V., page 114.

Intelligence from Scotland.

The paper quoted in this volume, under the title "Intelligence out of Scotland," contains the journal of one of Cecil's numerous spies. It is dated and marked with his own hand; and although its information is not implicitly to be relied on, it furnishes us with some curious details.

INTELLIGENCE OUT OF SCOTLAND THE 10TH NOVEMBER 1559.

First, the Earl Bothwell, the Lord Borthwick, and the Lord Seaton, are with the queen-dowager of Scotland, and taketh a plain part with her, and no other noblemen of Scotland. All the rest of the noblemen of Scotland taketh part with the Governor of Scotland.

"The governor's eldest son, the Earls of Argyle, Huntly, Glencairn, the Lord Revill, [Ruthven,] the Prior of St Andrews, the Master of Maxwell, the Lord of Livingston, [Lethington,] are made regents of the realm of Scotland by the Congregation, to have the governance of the same realm until they have a righteous prince amongst them; the which regents, with their trains, came to Edinburgh, *the 23d day of October* last, with twelve thousand men with them, and sat in council, and there deprived the said queen-dowager of all rule in Scotland; for that she did not keep promises with them, nor follow the counsel of the nobility of Scotland, for the weal of the realm, and the liberty of the same.

"At the coming of the said lords to Edinburgh, the queen, with her party, being three thousand French and four hundred Scots, removed to Leith.

"The last of October last past, in the night, the Earl Bothwell, accompanied with twenty four men, met the Lord of Ormiston, accompanied with six men, about Haddington, and there took from him six thousand crowns sterling, which the said lord was carrying to the governor, and hurt the same lord upon the face with a sword sore; that he lieth upon the same at his house of Ormiston.

"The advertisements of the taking of the same money came to the governor, who sent his eldest son, the Master of Maxwell, the Prior of St Andrews, and others, being seven hundred men or thereabout, to the castle of Crichton, the Earl Bothwell's chief house, distant from Edinburgh eight miles, who entered into the same, and put garrison into it upon Allhallows-day, and lay that night there, and came to Edinburgh on the morrow.

"Upon Allhallows-day, after the riding forth of the said governor, his son, and the others, the same was declared to the queen by a servant of the Bishop of Dumblain, and immediately after the same declaration, about one thousand five hundred French and Scotsmen issued out of Leith, and skirmished with about 11 c. [eleven hundred] Scotsmen that had laid two pieces of great ordnance upon a little hill beside Holyrood House, to shoot at Leith, and the Frenchmen won the one piece, and the other was bursted. And the same Frenchmen entered into Canongate, and spoiled the same to the port of the town, and slew twenty-one Scotsmen and three women, and six Frenchmen were slain at the same skirmish. And forty men of arms of France rode in at the Port, and went almost to the Tron, where they were put back by the governor and his party. The castle of

Edinburgh shot two cannons at the French party at the said skirmish, for the which the queen reproved the Lord Erskine, who made answer, that he would shoot at any person that went about to annoy the town of Edinburgh.

"The 3d of November present, the governor sent his son and the Master of Maxwell, with three hundred horsemen, to Crichton castle, who, at their arrival there, sent to the Earl Bothwell, being at the castle of Borthwick, and willed him to come and take part with the lords, which he refused to do; and then the governor's son spoiled the castle of Crichton, and had the spoil and all his evidents to the governor.

"The 4th November aforesaid, the queen sent to the lords, and moved them to quietness, saying, she would keep all promises with them, if they would do the like; whereunto they would not agree, saying, they had found her so false and unnatural, that they would never trust her, nor have to do with her nor France, but by the sword.

"The 6th November instant, the Congregation and the French skirmished together, at which was slain Alexander Halyburton, brother to the tutor of Pitcur, one of the best captains of Scotland, and thirty footmen of Scotland, and divers taken; and of the French six or seven slain, and six taken. The Lords of Scotland perceiving that their skirmishes chanced not well with them, and that they were not in a perfect readiness for the wars, put all the ordnance in Edinburgh castle upon band of the Lord Erskine, to have the same safely delivered to them again, and the said 6th of November, about midnight, removed to Lithgow, where they remained in consultation and preparing for the wars, and will set up a coin, saying, they shall coyne a good part of their plate for maintenance of the Word of God, and the wealth of Scotland.

"The morrow next after, being the 7th of November, the queen removed to Edinburgh, about ten of the clock before noon, where she remaineth, having all things there at her will; the most part of the inhabitants of Edinburgh fled out of the town, with bag and baggage, before her coming hither, and put a great part of their best stuff in Edinburgh castle for the safety thereof.

"The Bishops of St Andrews and Glasgow are with the queen, and the Bishops of the Out Isles and Galloway with the Lords and Congregation."

No. VI., page 118.

Treaty of Berwick.

At the time of the Treaty of Berwick, described in this volume, Cecil sent queries to the Scottish lords, to which he required them to make definite answers. The following paper, preserved in the State-paper Office, contains these questions and the replies. It is endorsed in Cecil's hand, "20th February 1559," and is in the handwriting of Sir R. Sadler:—

CERTAIN QUESTIONS PROPONED TO THE LORDS OF SCOTLAND, ANSWERED AND RESOLVED BY THEM.[1]

1. Whether they be able of themselves to resist the French power, and expel them out of Scotland?

Answer.—In respect of the fortresses which the French occupied in the time the queen-dowager bare rule, and yet do possess, we are not able without the queen's majesty's support to expel them, seeing the whole body of the realm is not as yet united.

Question.—What aid then is required?

Answer.—They require England to join with Scotland in league to expel these their enemies, and promise on their part to unite with England at all times against her enemies, and refer the specialty of the aid to herself.

Question.—What power, horse and foot, can they levy, and how soon?

Answer.—We would be able to bring five thousand men into the field, of which two thousand should watch and ward in company with the English soldiers according to the rate of their number, and with the other three thousand we shall keep the country in obedience, and make them be sure on all sides, night and day; that they shall need to attend upon nothing saving the French within the fort, and we shall meet their army at Acheson's Haven, the 25th day of March next coming.

Question.—How long they be able to abide and continue in the field?

Answer.—The whole nobility and landed men, with their households, shall remain continually, so long as the queen's majesty's power shall remain, how long soever it be, and the remanent number the space of twenty days after

1 Scots Correspondence, 20th February 1559.

the meeting and joining of both the armies, upon their own charges, and at the end of the said twenty days, shall have in readiness two thousand footmen, or thereby, to receive wages of the queen's majesty, and continue so long as need shall be, and three or four hundred light horsemen, if it be thought convenient in like manner to receive wages. And as to the number of the nobility, landed men, and their households, which shall remain after the said twenty days, it shall be declared unto you before the end of the said twenty days, that you may be assured what you shall trust to.

Question.—What ordnance for battery, and what munition can they bring?

Answer.—It is not unknown to you that all the artillery and munition of Scotland is in the hands of the queen and the French, and [in] the strengths that are not in our hands.

Question.—What carriages can they furnish for the transport of great ordnance?

Answer.—The artillery and draught gear being brought to Acheson's Haven by sea, the lack of carriage horses supplied from thence to Leith.

Question.—What number of pioneers they can help us with?

Answer.—We believe, assuredly, that on the queen's majesty's charges, we shall levy three or four hundred, or more if need be.

Question. — What necessaries they have for scaling and assaulting of forts?

Answer.—They have none in store, but whatsoever is in the country will be at their command; and there is wood and broom enough within four miles of Leith.

Question.—How they can furnish the army with victuals for horse and men?

Answer.—Plenty of oats for horses; as to forage, they cannot say much till they see how far the country is destroyed; as to men, commissaries with a convenient sum of money should be sent into Scotland, to buy up victuals, of which there will be plenty. There is arrested in merchants' hands in Dundee two hundred tuns of wine, which will be delivered into the commissaries' hands for thirty-four pounds Scottish the tun—viz., eight pounds ten shillings sterling.

Question. — Where and when their power and ours shall join together?

Answer.—It shall be the greatest ease for us to meet you in some part of Lothian where ye think good, but always we reserve that to your discretion.

Question.—Are they able to take and occupy Edinburgh? What as to the Lord Erskine?

Answer.—It is too great a hazard to attempt Edinburgh before the joining of the armies, because we doubt the French, as desperate men, will enterprise a battle. As to Lord Erskine, they will promise nothing assuredly, but hope he will be no enemy.

Question.—How the Borderers in Scotland may be reduced to take part with the said lords in this cause?

Answer.—They are labouring presently, and are in good hope to reduce the most part of them thereto; for the obstinate they will take order as you may advise.

Question.—What number of ships for the wars?

Answer.—No great number at their command, but there are some which will make forth against the French at their own adventure.

Question.—Where they shall be able to lodge in towns together six hundred demi-lances and six hundred light horsemen?

Answer.—They shall be placed in Edinburgh, if it may be had, failing thereof, in towns thereabouts, the most commodious to be left to them in all sorts.

Question.—Where we may best land our artillery and munition?

Answer.—At Acheson's Haven; there is good hard ground from thence to Leith.

No. VII.

Letters of the Lord James, afterwards Regent Moray.[1]

The Lord James St Andrews to Sir William Cecil.

"Right Honourable Sir,—After all loving commendation. Albeit I have in a general letter with my brethren presently written unto you, and as the present bearer, my good friend, may sufficiently instruct you of all things needful, yet have I thought necessary to gratify in one part your good mind at all times shewn, not only towards our common cause, but also in particular towards me, which, as it is in all sorts undeserved on my side, so am I the more affected unto you therefor, which, God

[1] Preserved in the State-paper Office.

willing, you shall apperceive indeed, if ever the goodness of God shall grant, the good opinion and expectation that causeless ye have conceived of me, shall come to good maturity and fruit—God of His mercy grant it may. And as I have found this your good mind unrequired, having found it, I am bold to desire you most earnestly to continue in the same, as well towards the weal of our common cause as of myself, as I persuade myself ye will; and to that effect, I have my good friend the young Laird of Lethington, bearer hereof, and his proceedings towards the premises, most heartily recommended him unto your honour's wisdom and good council, whom God mot prosper to His glory.—At Sanct Andrews the 15th day of November 1559.

"By your assured friend,
"JAMES SANCTAND."[1]

THE LORD JAMES TO THE DUKE OF NORFOLK.

"Please your grace, after my departing from Berwick, I safely arrived in Fife, and found my Lord of Arran in St Andrews, ready to depart towards my Lord of Huntly in St Johnston, with whom I departed towards him, and after mutual conference, has found him to see throughout thir present matters, and willing to shew himself to the furtherance of the same at this present, which I suppose he testifies by his writings to the queen's majesty, and also to Mr Cecil with his own servant, who is also instructed with credit, and if it shall please your grace, in my opinion these writings should be kept in store for all adventures. Since my returning from my Lord of Huntly, which was the 1st of this instant, I have been continually travelling in the towns here upon the sea-coast for preparation of victuals against the arrival of the commissaries, and also upon the preparation of our folks, assuring ourselves of meeting upon the day appointed. And in case any let come on your side, (as God forbid,) it will please your grace to make us an advertisement, because we look for none, and so commits your grace to the protection of the Eternal. At Pittenweem the 8th March 1559.

"By your grace to command,
"JAMES STEWART."

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, endorsed by Cecil, Lord James St Andrews, 15th Nov. 1559.

LORD JAMES TO SECRETARY CECIL.

"After most hearty commendation, as travelling with my Lord Duke's Grace of Norfolk, and all times before, I have found the favour of God prospering His work in the hands of His servants, even so perceive I still and sensyne His blessing always to continue therewith. My Lord of Huntly, with a great part of the north, as I look for, will keep the affixed [time] betwixt my Lord Duke and us, whereof I trust you shall be certified by his own writing, which I would wish were kept in store. And further, I hope in God there shall be very few of the nobility that shall not join them at this time; and if God shall grant us good luck and success in this journey, I am persuaded the matter that all godly men so long have desired, and wise men travelled to bring to pass, shall be, by the tender mercy of God, most happily achieved, to the great comfort of us, and the great felicity of the ages to come; and seeing it cometh near the birth, let no earnest labourer (as you are) faint in the Lord's work; who mot prosper the same in your hands. From Pittenweem the 8th of March 1559.

"By your assured good friend,
"JAMES STEWART."

No. VIII., page 119.

Character of the Earl of Huntly.

This nobleman, perhaps the most powerful baron in Scotland, has been somewhat undeservedly lauded. Like his brethren, he was crafty, selfish, and ambitious. The following letter from his brother, the Bishop of Caithness, and the interesting paper which follows it, disclose his secret transactions with the Lords of the Congregation, and throw light on the severity with which he was afterwards treated by Mary:—

LETTER FROM A. GORDON TO THE DUKE OF NORFOLK.

"After hearty commendations to your grace, it will please you to wit, that in consideration of the relation made by the queen-dowager to divers of your grace's countrymen, quha spak her in the castle of Edinburgh, that my lord my brother, the Earl of Huntly, would by no way assist or concur with us in defence of this our common and godly action, I will be so bold, with your grace's pardon, to assure you of the contrary. Notwithstanding the great policy

and craft used by the said queen-dowager to empesche the same, who has done utter diligence to break the whole nobility of his country against him, which was the principal and chiefest occasion of his tarry; who *beis* unfailand in our camp, the 20th or 21st of this present April, to assist and set forward these our proceedings and godly union, at the uttermost of his power.[1]

"Edinburgh, 18th April 1560."

The second paper to which I allude is endorsed by Randolph, THE REQUESTS OF THE EARL OF HUNTLY TO THE LORDS, and dated in Cecil's handwriting, part of which is torn away, 18th April 1560.

"Forasmuch as by the labour, persuasions, and suborning of the French part, and others their favourers and part takers within this realm, there is a con[tract] and league made by their means among a great number of the nobles of the north parts of this realm, certain clans, and islesmen of the same, that they shall maintain, and with their power extreme defend, the auld manner of religion, and French authority within this realm; nothingless to the resistance of my lord duke's grace, and others his part takers, nor for invading of me, my friends, and part takers, and destroying of our *rowmes* that shall assist with his grace, of the which they have begun one part already. Wherefore, the said Earl of Huntly, since he adventures his body, life, rents, and lands, with his whole friends that will do for him, desires that my lord duke, and others the noblemen assisters to his grace's proceedings, make him, his friends and part takers, an assured promise under their handwrits to their maintenance in their lives, rents, lands, and possessions. And that, by his grace and them, the said earl and his assisters might have the queen's majesty of England's aid and support when he shall [require] the same, as well for to defend their incursions and pursuits, as to pursue them and their rowmes that will not concur with him to the duke's grace's effect, and the maintaining the liberty of this realm, and commonweal thereof, so far as we are within the north parts of the mount.

"Item.—Desires in like manner, that where he understands the duke's grace, with his council, is already disponing to sundry men certain rowmes in these north parts, and to them in special which shall be found of the said confederacy; that in that respect his grace, nor his council and part takers, shall dispone nothing of the lands and duties of the kirk escheats, and casualties of thir parts, but to such as shall be his concurrents, and join themselves with him to the forthsetting of the action of the common weal, or, at the least, without his [lordship's] consent and advice, and that within the shires of Aberdeen, Banff, Moray, Nairn, and Inverness.

"Item.—Because it is not unknown his lordship and his predecessors to have been, under his sovereign, the man to have had the supreme authority in the north in time by past, and power given to them by their sovereigns for the time, desires to have suchlike power and authority as before times, with assistance and maintenance of his grace and his assisters both of Scotland and England, so that not only shall any of his own pretend to disobey or ly aback in this action, but by the said power, assistance, and authority, he may inbring them with the rest of their adherents, so that the liberty and common weal of this poor realm might be more easily preserved, and he and his part takers may, through such authority and help, the more heartily concur and ware their lives, and hazard their heritages in the said action: And who shall be required by the duke, and the lords his grace's assisters, to concur in the forthsetting of the said action, and refuses the same, and the rest at his grace's command, shall be pursued by the said Earl of Huntly in that case; their escheats and *rowmes* to be disponed to him and such other gentlemen and barons that serves with him."

THE LORDS' ANSWER TO THE EARL OF HUNTLY.[2]

To the 1st,—The answer made is, "That by the band entered into by the Congregation, they are bound mutually to defend each other; and if Huntly joins them, he will participate in this obligation, and enjoy the benefit."

To the 2d,—"Huntly has seen the copy of the contract between them and the queen's majesty, by which she obliges herself to support and defend them; and if Huntly joins them, he will be included in the benefit of this contract as one of themselves."

[1] Endorsed by Cecil, Bishop of Athens to the Duke of Norfolk.

[2] Scots Correspondence, dated in Cecil's hand, 18th April 1560.

Where in the second article it is alleged that the said earl understands they are already disponing certain rowmes to sundry men in the north parts, . . it is answered, "That the lords have made no disposition of anything to any persons, but only constitute factours, ... and no factours made of any rowmes in these parts; and his lordship coming and adjoining him to the said lords, no disposition of factorie shall be made by [contrary to] his advice."

To the 3d,—That he have the same authority as his predecessors have had before him in the north parts, it is answered, "That the lords as yet have never taken upon them the disposition *of escheats or office of lieutenandrie, fearing, if they would pretend any such matter, it would be sinisterly interpreted, and the adversaries would calumniate them as usurpers of our sovereign's authority.* Nevertheless, perceiving my Lord of Huntly's good affection to haste a moyen, whereby all men may be adjoined to this cause, they are content to grant to my lord at his coming hither to them, all and whatsoever things may so further the cause that he himself will think that they may do, remaining obedient subjects, and reserving their obedience to their sovereign; and for that they may see he requires this only for furtherance of the common cause, and not for any commodity, they will in this article follow his good advice and counsel after his coming. At which time, in this as in all others, he shall be satisfied."

No. IX.

An Irish Ambassador in 1560.

The following extract from a letter addressed by Randolph to Cecil is amusing, in the vivid portrait it gives us of O'Neil's ambassador, and in shewing also that the Irish language was written and understood by the inhabitants of the north of Scotland as late, at least, as August 25, 1560, the date of this letter. It is preserved in the State-paper Office:—

"May it please you to understand that, the 16th of this present, there came to the Earl of Argyle, out of Ireland, an ambassador from O'Neil. What was his message, and effect of his embassy, your honour may perceive by these letters which the Earl of Argyle hath sent, beside also some other matter that he requireth to be advertised of from your honour as you see time. The letter that he received from O'Neil he caused to be translated into English, and hath, notwithstanding, sent you the original, *ad faciendam majorem fidem*, and also for you to see the strangeness of their orthography: this he desireth to be sent unto him again.

"The manner and behaviour of him from whom the letter came is not so strange as it was wonderful to see the presence of his ambassador. A man that exceedeth many in stature. He walked afoot out of Erland hither alone; his diet, by reason of the length of his journey, so failed him that he was fain to leave his saffron shirt in gage. The rest of his apparel such, that the earl, before he would give him audience, arrayed him new from the neck downwards; for razor he would none; his lodging was in the chimney, his drink chiefly aquavitæ and milk. Though the message that he came of was such as the Earl of Argyle by no means will consent unto for divers respects; as, chiefly, the ungodliness of the person, and the worthiness of his sister, of whom I hear great commendation: yet will he not utterly shake him off, or give him any resolute answer, but intendeth awhile to entertain him, to see what good may be done upon him, either to bring him to God or more civility."

No. X.

Mary's Aversion to Knox.

The following extract from a letter of Throckmorton to Queen Elizabeth, dated 13th July 1561, Paris, and preserved in the French Correspondence of the State-paper Office, evinces the strong aversion which the young Queen of Scots had conceived against this reformer, previous to her arrival in her dominions:—

"The said queen's [Scotland] determination to go home continues still; she goeth shortly from the court to Fescamp in Normandy, there to make her mother's funerals and burial, and from thence to Calais, there to embark. . . The late unquietness in Scotland hath disquieted her very much, and yet stayeth not her journey. The 5th of this present, the Earl of Bothwell arrived here in post. . . I understand that the Queen of Scotland is thoroughly persuaded that the most dangerous man in all her realm of Scotland, both to her intent there, and the dissolving of the

league between your maj: and that realm, is Knokes. And therefore is fully determined to use all the means she can devise to banish him thence, or else to assure them that she will never dwell in that country as long as he is there; and to make him the more odious to your maj: and that at your hands he receive neither courage nor comfort, she mindeth to send very shortly to your maj: (if she have not already done it) to lay before you the book that he hath written against the government of women, (which your maj: hath seen already,) thinking thereby to animate your maj: against him; but whatsoever the said queen shall insinuate your maj: of him, I take him to be as much for your maj: purpose,—and that he hath done, and doth daily, as good service for the advancement of your maj: desire in that country, and to establish a mutual benevolence and common quiet between the two realms, as any man of that nation: his doings wherein, together with his zeal well known, have sufficiently recompensed his faults in writing that book; and therefore [he] is not to be driven out of that realm."

No. XI.

Mary and Lethington.

It has been stated in this volume, p. 140, that, previous to her setting out from France, Mary addressed letters of forgiveness and kindness to nearly all her subjects who filled offices of trust. The following letter she sent to Secretary Lethington. It is printed from a copy endorsed by Cecil, "Queen of Scots' letter to the L. of Lethington, 29th June 1561, preserved in the State-paper Office:"—

"Lethington. Jay receu vostre lettre du x^me^ de ce moys. Et vous employant en mon service et faisant bien suyvant la bonne volunté q m'asseurez en avoir; il ne fault point que vous craignez les calomniateurs ny rapporteurs, car ils n'auront jamais bonne part auprès de moy. Je prend garde aux effects devant q'adjouster foy en tout à ce que l'on me dit. Et quant au scrupule que pourroit proceder de l'accointance qu'avez en Angleterre il cessera avec l'intelligence que vous y pouvez avoir. A quoy il vous est ayse remedier si vous voulez. Et pour ce vous avez este l'instrument et principal negociateur de toutes les practiques que ma noblesse a eu en Angleterre, si vous desirez que oultre ce que J'ay déjà oublyé toutes offences passées comme Je vous ay escript cy devant, Je me fye à bon (effient) et me serve de vous, faictes que les ostages qui sont au dict pays en soyent retirez, et vous employez à dissouldre ce que vous avez moyenne et solicite en c'est endroict, avec tel effect, Je me puisse asseurer de vostre bonne affection. Vous avez l'entendement et dextérité de faire plus que cela, et ne se passe rien entre ma noblesse dont vous n'ayez cognoissance, et que vostre advice n'y soit receu. *Aussi Je ne veulx vous celer, que s'il se faict quelque chose qui n'aille droit par cy apres me fiant de vous,* vous estez celluy à qui je m'en prendray le premier. Je veulx vivre doresnavant en toute amytie et bonne voisinance avec la Royne d'Angleterre; et suis sur mon partement pour passer en mon Royaume où j'espere estre danz le tems que J'ay mande par le Prieur de St Andrè.—A mon arrivée par dela jauray besoing trouver quelques deniers pour subvenir à ma maison, et autres necessitez. Il en est sort y depuis ung an une bonne somme du proffict de ma monnoye, e y a assui dautres casualitez. Vous me ferez plaisir de tener la main que de coste ou dautre J'en puisse trouver de prestz pour mon ayder promptement. Et cependant vous me scrivez et donnerez advis de tout. Jay veu par vostre lettre comme vous avez faict publier et executer celles que n'aguieres je vous avez envoyées touchant les alienations des terres ecclesiastiques—Et quant à la declaration de mon intention plus avant, estant sur mon dict parlement Je lay remyse apres mon arrivée. Je feray bien ayse de voir et intendre comme les choses sont passés en cest endroict tant auparavant les troubles que depuis le commencement d'iceulx, priant Dieu, Lethington vous avoir en sa saincte garde. Escript à Paris, le xxix Jour de Jung, 1561."

No. XII.

Elizabeth's violent refusal of a Passport to Mary.

It appears, from the following letter of Lethington to Cecil, dated at Edinburgh, 15th August 1561, that the English queen had so far suffered herself to be overcome by passion, as openly to declare to D'Oseli that she would not suffer his mistress to come into her own dominions:—

"Sir,—Hither came yesternight from France a Scottish gentleman called Capt. Anstruther, sent by the queen our sovereign, who left her maj: (as he saith) at Morin, six leagues from the court at St Germains, where she had left the king, and was coming towards Calais, there to embarque. He hath letters to the most part of the noblemen, whereby she doth complain that the queen's majesty not only hath refused passage to Monsieur D'Osell, and the safe conduct which she did courteously require for herself, but also doth make open declaration that she will not suffer her to come home to her own realm; yet is her affection such towards her country, and so great desire she hath to see us, that she meaneth not for that threatening to stay, but taketh her journey with two galleys only, without any forces, accompanied with her three uncles, the Duke D'Aumali, the Marquis d'Elboef, and the Great Prior, one of the constable's sons, Monsieur Damville, and their trains, and so trust her person in our hands. In the meantime, thinking that the queen's maj: will by some means practique the subjects of this realm, she hath written to divers, and specially those whom she knoweth most affectioned, to continue the intelligence, willing them in anywise that they receive no ambassador from her majesty, nor renew any league with her highness, unto such time as she be present with us: the bearer saith that she will arrive before the 26th day of this instant. What this message meaneth I cannot judge: I marvel that she will utter anything to us which she would have kept close for you: and if two galleys may quietly pass, I wish the passport had been liberally granted. To what purpose should you open your pack and sell none of your wares, or declare you enemies to those whom you cannot offend? It passeth my dull capacity to imagine what this sudden enterprise should mean. We have determined to trust no more than we shall see, yet can I not but fear the issue for lack of charges and sufficient power. If anything chance amiss, we shall feel the first dint; but I am sure you see the consequence. It shall be well done that the Q. maj: keep some ordinary power at Berwick, of good force, so long as we stand in doubtful terms, as well for safety of the peace as our comfort. The neighbourhood of your men will discourage our enemies and make us the bolder. My wit is not sufficient to give advice in so dangerous a cast, but I mean well. God maintain his cause, and those that mean uprightly. I pray you send me your advice what is best to be done, as well in the common cause, as in my particular, who am taken to be a chief meddler and principal negotiator of all the practiques with that realm. Though I be not in greatest place, yet is not my danger least, specially when she shall come home, having so late received at the Q. maj: hands (as she will think) so great a discourtesy. This Capt. Anstruther hath also a commission to receive from the French captains the Castle of Dunbar, and the fort of Inchkeith, and to send home all the soldiers. I have heard that the queen meaneth to draw home the Earl of Lennox furth of England, and to make him an instrument of division in this realm, setting him up against the Duke of Chastelherault. I trust the queen's maj: will have good regard thereto. In anywise let me hear, I pray you, often from you. If I may receive every four or five days a line or two from you, it shall be my greatest comfort; and because I must now be jealous of my letters, I pray you make some mention in yours of the receipt of so many as I have sent you this month. (This is the third.) . . Edinburgh, the 15th day of August 1561.

"Yours at commandment,

"W. MAITLAND."

No. XIII.

Lethington and Cecil.

As an example of Lethington's lighter epistolary style, the reader may be interested in the following letter, written to Cecil when the Scottish secretary was in love with Mary Fleming, one of the queen's Marys, whom he afterwards married. It is amusing to find that he had chosen so grave a confident as Cecil. There is preserved in the British Museum a pathetic letter of this Mary Fleming, written to Lord Burleigh, entreating him to use his influence with Morton, that the body of Lethington, her husband, might suffer no shame. It has been printed by Chalmers, from the original in the Cotton collection.—Life of Mary, vol. ii. p. 502.

LEDINGTON TO CECIL.[1]

"SIR,—I have of late been somewhat perplexed, understanding that you were sick, the rather that I could not have certain knowledge whether it was the cough which universally did reign, or other more dangerous disease, which did trouble you. I am glad to hear, by the report of such as come from hence, that you have recovered your health, and yet will not be fully assured thereof, until such time as I shall see the same testified by some letter, written with your own hand. I am not *tam cupidus rerum novarum* that I desire any change; and if my fortune should be at any time to come in that realm, I wish not to have occasion to make any new acquaintance. I confess I have found in you some lacks, and points which I have wished to be reformed, and shall still find, so long as you do not fully satisfy my affections, (such is the nature of man and phylantye (*φιλαντια*) which maketh us fancy too much our own conceptions.) Yet, I do not look for any full reformation of you in that behalf, and not the less when I do indifferently and without passion behold your proceedings; and even such as I appear most to mislike, I am constrained to think that, if any other occupied the same place, I might perhaps have matter ministered unto me of more misliking. Therefore, how far soever I mislike you, I wish you to do well to yourself, and suffer neither the evil weather nor evil world kill you. As there are in you many good parts which I require in myself, so I find in me one great virtue, whereof, for your commodity, I wish you a portion—to wit, the common affairs do never so much trouble me, but that at least I have one merry hour of the four and twenty; and you labour continually without intermission, nothing considering that the body, yea, and the mind also, must sometime have recreation, or else they cannot long last. Such physic as I do minister unto myself I appoint for you. Marry, you may, perhaps, reply that, as now the world doth go with me, my body is better disposed to digest such than yours is, (for those that be in love are ever set upon a merry pin,) yet I take this to be a most singular remedy for all diseases in all persons. You see how I abuse my leisure, and do trouble your occupations with matters of so light moment. It is not for lack of a more grave subject, but that I purposely forbear it, not knowing in what sort I may touch it and avoid offence. I will, with better devotion, look for other matter in your next letter, than for any answer to this foolish letter of mine, and yet, rather to be advertised of your convalescence. You can impart those news to none that will be more glad of them. Like as, if you will command anything that lieth in my power conveniently to do, you will find none, next your son, over whom you have more authority. And so, after my most hearty commendations, I take my leave.—From Edinburgh, the last of February 1564.

"Yours at command,

"W. MAITLAND."

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Edinburgh, 28th February 1564-5.

No. XIV.

Characteristic Letter of Knox.

The following letter of this reformer (alluded to in this volume, p. 179) is addressed to Randolph, and dated at Edinburgh, 3d ——, 1564. Some few words are unreadable, but, as a whole, it is very characteristic:—

"Both yours are come to my hands, with your bow, for the which I heartily thank you. Rollet's tidings are as yet buried in breasts of two within this realm, but *Maddye* telleth us many news. The mess shall up; the Bishop of Glasgow and Abbot of Dunfermline come as ambassadors from the General Council. My Lord Bothwell shall follow with power to put in execution whatsoever is demanded and our sovereign will have done, and then shall Knox and his preaching be pulled by the ears. Thus with us raves Maddye every day, but hereupon I greatly pause not. The Earl of Lennox servant is familiarly in court; and it is supposed that it is not without knowledge, yea, and labour, of your court. Some in this country look for the lady and the young earl or it be long: it is whispered to me that licence is already procured for their hithercoming. God's providence is inscrutable to man before the issue of such things as are kept close for a season in his council; *but, to be plain with you, that journey and progress I like not.* The Q. maj: remains at St Johnston, as I hear, yet eight days, yea, and perchance

longer: as for Edinburgh, it likes the ladies nothing. In these last ships from France and Flanders, I have received some news, and some are coming; certain of the saltmaker's labourers are arrived with mattocks, schooles, and certain other instruments; more are looked for: I fear their traffic shall be to make salt upon salt. Divine what I mean. I hear of credible report, and that of such as are privy in the court of France, that the journey of Loraine goes forward. Letters I received dated in . . . in Champagne, assuring that the king was so far in journey, if other impediments occurred not. The Papists of France (of Paris especially) threaten destruction to all Protestants. The Germans, almost in every city and province, amass men of war, and no man can tell at whose devotion. If ye know, I am content; if not, my counsel is, you look to it. Two barges, in form and fashion like hoys, came in our Firth, abone [above] the Inch, and viewed all places, Sunday and Monday last. They sailed from land to land, round about the Inch, but would suffer no man to enter in them; and so are departed. Our Solan geese use to vesey [inspect] the Bass before the great company take possession: I say yet again, take heed. I hear (but not of certainty) that Sweden will yet visit us with an ambassador. I pray you yet again salute my Lord of Bedford, of whose good mind towards me I never doubted, and say to his lordship that I think I shall have as great need of comfort ere it be long, as that I had when his L. and I last parted in London, if God put not end to my battle shortly; for here wanton and wicked will empires, as it were, above wisdom and virtue: God send remedy. And thus ye know a part of my mind; and yet, if I were not I would trouble you longer. My purpose is, if God permit, to be in Langton the 3d Sunday of May. You may appoint the place, and I will meet you: whom the Eternal preserve. Of Edinburgh, the 3d of this present (or instant) 1564.

"Salute in my name Mr —— and the Italian, to whom great business suffers me not to write.

"Yours, to his power,

"JOHN KNOX."

No. XV., page 215.

Plot of Lennox and Darnley against Mary's Crown and Life.

In the letter from Randolph to the Earl of Leicester, which is quoted in the text, p. 215, the reader is aware that he alludes darkly to a plot of the king, and the Earl of Lennox, his father, to deprive the queen of her crown, perhaps of her liberty and life. "I know," says he, "these practices in hand contrived between the father and son to come by the crown against her will. . . I know, that if that take effect which is intended, David shall have his throat cut within these ten days. *Many things grievouser and worse than these are brought to my ears, yea, of things intended against her own person, which, because* I think it better to keep secret than write to Mr Secretary, I speak not of them but now to your lordship."

It is of great importance in the question of Mary's guilt or innocence to ascertain the truth of the existence of such a plot against her crown and life by her husband the king, and his father, — and I have found amongst the valuable collections of Prince Labanoff a paper copied from the Archives of the House of Medici, which strongly corroborates it. I give it here with kind permission. It is thus entitled:—

AVVISI DI SCOTIA, DELLI 11, 13, AND 28, DI MARZO, 1566. SOPRA GLI ANDAMENTI DI QUEL REGNO.

Li Ribelli di Scotia che stavano in Inghilterra, col consenso del nove Re di Scotia ritornorno a casa loro, e trattavano co il Re suddetto di darli la Corona hereditale, accio che lui restasse Re absoluto, ancora che la Regina morisse senza figlioli.

Detto Re persuadendosi simil fatto, *consentiva alla morte della Regina sua moglie, e gia aveva consentito alla Morte De David Riccio, lo Secretario de detta Regina*, et lei aveva fatto riserrar in una camera, con guardia d'Heretici, accio che li Cattolici non la potessero soccorrere, e fra tanto attendevano detti Hereteci, a far che il stato tutto consentisse alla incoronazione di detto Re, et alla privazione del Governo di detta Regina. Al che non consentendo il Populo, e avendo il Re la mala persuasione fatta a gli da quelli tristi ribaldi, si pente dell' errore, e seno ando dalla Regina, alla quale dopo averla

salutata amorevolmente raconto tutto il successo, e gl'adimando perdona del animo suo tristo hauto contra di lei, la quale con piu buon animo, e lieta fronte che puote lo ricevette, dicendoli che non credeva che egli havesse mai hauto simile intentione contra di lei, et che se forse fosse incorso in qualche mancamento di fede, che pregava Iddio gli perdonasse, et lei non solamente gli perdonava ma etiam perdonava a tutti gli altri, che la persequitavano, e cosi subito tutti due si raconsiliorno et cercorono via di salvarsi.

Stando il Re con la Regina gli Heretici credevano che lui tratasse, acciochè lei sotto scrivesse certi Capitole che essi adimandavano sopra la perdonanza, et retributione de suoi beni, il che dicendo il Re alla Regina che cosi aveva promesso di fare, lei subito diede modo al Re, che se ritornasse da loro con dirgli, che la Regina voleva fare ogni cosa, che a dimandavano, e cosi se ne ando il Re da essi heretici et lettoli il proposito che fu da loro creduto, gli exorto a mettere la Regina in liberta, promettendo lui di guardarla, che non potesse fuggire, al che loro per compiacere al Re consentivono, e se ne partirono lasciando la Regina in mano del Re suo marito.

Parliti gli heretici, il Re e la Regina mandorono subito per un Capitano loro confidente, il quale vinne con buon numero di soldati Catolici per una parte segreta, che non furono veduti dalli inimici, e gionte da loro maestra se ne fuggirono, a una Fortezza chiamata Don Bar, dove arrivorono al alba del giorno, et ivi aspettorono il soccorso di nove mille fanti Cattolici, con quali andorono contra detti Ribelli, et gli schacciarono di quel suo Regno, et sono ritornati detti Heretici in Inghilterra.

Ritornate il Re et la Regina a Lisleborgo, dove successe il suddetto, fecero tagliar la testa a cinque principali di quella Citta authori et inventori di simile impresa.

La Regina d'Inghilterra, *quale era stata causa del tutto* intendendo la pace fra il Re et Regina di Scotia, s'attristo molto et fece scrivere per il suo Secretario Cecille, per tutto il Regno, che la causa di tutto il suddetto, era perche il Re haveva trovato il detto Ricciolo a dormire con la Regina—il che non fu mai vero.[1] . . .

It is evident that these Advices from Scotland were given by a person on the spot, and intimately acquainted with the object and circumstances of the plot against Riccio; and the statement it contains of Darnley's consent to the queen's death is of great importance—for this fact once admitted, and discovered by Mary, her position in reference to a husband whom she knew had plotted against her own life was materially altered.

[1] Filza 3 de Carteggio e affari con la Corte d'Inghilterra. Collated and certified by the Archivista, G. Tanfani.

No. XVI., page 216.

Historical Remarks on Knox's implication in Riccio's Murder.

It has long been known that some of the principal supporters of the Protestant cause in Scotland were implicated in the assassination of Riccio; but it has hitherto been believed that their great ecclesiastical leader, Knox, was not privy to this murder. From the language in which the event is told in his History, it might be inferred, indeed, that he did not condemn the assassination of one whom he regarded as a bitter enemy to the truth.[2] "After this manner above specified," says he, "to wit, by the death of David Rizzio, the noblemen were relieved of their trouble, and restored to their places and rowmes,[3] and likewise the Church reformed, and all that professed the Evangel within this realm, after fasting and prayer, were delivered:" but in weighing this passage it is to be remembered that, although the Fifth Book of Knox's History was probably composed from notes and collections left by the Reformer, it was not written by him.[4] The late Dr M'Crie, his excellent biographer, has this sentence upon the subject, which, from the authority deservedly attached to his life of Knox, may be taken as the present popular belief upon the point:—"There is no reason to think that he [Knox] was privy to the conspiracy which proved fatal to Riccio: but it is probable that he had expressed his satisfaction at an event which contributed to the safety of religion and of the commonwealth, if not also his approbation of the conduct of the conspirators."[5]

As Dr M'Cric had not the advantage

[2] Knox's History, p. 344.

[3] Offices.

[4] M'Crie's Life of Knox by Dr Crichton, pp. 250, 416, and Prefatory Notice to Bannatyne's Memorials, p. 20.

[5] Life of Knox, p. 253, edited by Dr Crichton.

of consulting those letters upon this subject which I have found in the State-paper Office, and by which the whole secret history of the conspiracy against Riccio has been developed, we are not to wonder that he should have spoken so decisively of Knox's innocence of any previous knowledge of the plot. I shall now state, as clearly as I can, the evidence upon which I have affirmed in the text that he was precognisant of the intended murder, adding, at the same time, some letters which may be quoted in his defence.

The reader is already aware that Riccio was assassinated on the 9th of March 1565-6; that Ruthven, Morton, and Lethington fled on the queen's escape, and meditated advance to Edinburgh, (March 18;) and that, while other accomplices secreted themselves in Scotland, Morton and Ruthven took refuge in England. Such being the state of things, on the 21st of March the Earl of Bedford, then at Berwick, of which he was governor, thus wrote to Cecil :—

"You shall understand that the Lord Ruthven is come hither for his own safety, who, passing through Tiviotdale, came to Wark castle, and being troubled with sickness, and therefore weak, tarried the longer upon the way thence afore he came here. I received him, (as I have learned that the ancient order is in like cases,) and so mean to do such other as shall for like purposes come. He keepeth most commonly his bed for that small time that he hath as yet tarried here, and therefore is not so likely to depart hence of some good time.

"The Earl Morton is gone towards Carlisle, and from thence will take his way towards Newcastle, and so hitherward for some time, to talk with the Lord Ruthven. The Lord Lindsay and the Laird of Liddington are both gone to the Earl of Athole for their safeguard: Liddington, as I hear, will come hither if by any means he can, whereof, as it cometh to pass, you shall further understand.

"The Earls of Argyle, Glencairn, and Rothes have received their dress,[1] and so are in quiet, or, at the least, in hope they shall be quiet. The Earl of Moray, the Lairds of Grange and Patarro, and the Tutor of Pitcur, have refused the like dress as the other have received, seeming thereby the less willing to receive the dress offered them, for that these lords their friends were excluded out of the favour and pardon, and so hardly put at; yet it is thought they will receive it, for so in any wise have these lords now abroad desired them.

"Their king remaineth utter enemy to these lords now abroad, notwithstanding his former doings with them. Hereof, and for that Mr Randolph *writeth also more at large of the names of such as now be gone abroad*, I shall not trouble you therewith."[2] . . .

This letter was written from Berwick eleven days after the murder, and about a week after the flight of the conspirators, here called "those that be gone abroad;" and we see that, in the last sentence, Bedford mentions to Cecil that he will not trouble him with any further details, as Mr Randolph was at that very time writing to him, and would send in his letter the names of the conspirators who had gone abroad.

This letter of Randolph's is accordingly in the State-paper Office, and pinned to it I found the promised list of names.[3] I shall first give the letter, and then the "list." The letter, which is addressed to Cecil, is wholly in Randolph's hand; the list is in the hand of a clerk, who I find at that time was employed by Bedford in his confidential correspondence. The letter, which is addressed to Cecil, is as follows :—

RANDOLPH TO CECIL.

"*Berwick*, 21*st March* 1565-6.

"May it please your honour,

"Since Mr Carew's departure hence, this hath happened. The queen, to be revenged upon the lords that gave the last attemptate and slew David, is content to remit unto the former lords, with whom she was so grievously offended, all that they had done at any time against her; who, seeing now their liberty and restitution offered unto them, were all content, saving my Lord of Moray, to leave the other lords that were the occasion of their return, and took several appointment as they could get it, of which the first was the Earl of Glencairn, next Rothes, Argyle,

[1] Pardon.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Bedford to Cecil, Berwick, this 21st March 1565.

[3] This list is now bound up with the volume. See the handwriting of letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Bedford to Cecil, 27th March 1568.

and so every one after other, saving, as I said, my Lord of Moray, with him Patarro and Grayne, [Grange,] who, standing so much upon their honours and promise, will not leave the other without some likelihood to do them good.

"The lords of the last attemptate, which were these:—Morton, Ruthven, Lindsay, and Leddington, finding these men fall from them, whom they trusted so much in, and for whose cause they had so far ventured themselves, found it best to save themselves in time; and, therefore, upon Sunday last,[1] every one of the four above named departed their several way, my Lord of Morton towards the west Borders, my Lord Ruthven through Tividale, and so came to Wark, and yesterday to this town; the Lord Lindsay into Fife, Liddington to Athole, to my L. there, either to be saved by him, or to purchase his pardon of the Q. which is thought will be so hard as may be, and therefore is he looked for very shortly to be in this country, if he can escape.

"Besides these that were the principal takers in hand of this matter, there are also these:—the Laird of Ormiston, Hawton his son-in-law, Cawder his nephew, Brunston, Whytlyngham, Andrew Car of Fawlsyde, Justice-clerk brother, George Douglas, and some other; of the town of Edinburgh divers: so that, as I judge, there are as many like to take hurt in this action as were in the former. What is become of any of these I know not as yet, saving Andrew Car that came to this town with the L. Ruthven and his son.

"The Q. upon Monday last[2] returned to Edinburgh. In her company the Earls Bothwell, Huntly, Marshal, Hume, Seton, with as many as there [they] were able to bring with them. Where she was wont to be carried in a chair by four of her guard, she is yet able to ride upon a horse, though by her own account she hath not six weeks to her time. She lodgeth not in the abbey, but in a house in the town in the High Street. Her husband hath disclosed all that he knew of any man; and yet hath given his hand, and subscribed divers bands and writings, testifying that to be his own deed, and done by his commandment. It is said that he gave him one blow himself; and, to signify that the deed was his, his dagger was left standing in his body after he was dead. Their mind was to have hanged him, but because business rose in the court between the Earl Bothwell and such as were appointed to keep the house, they went the next way to work with him. . . . At Berwick, the 21st March 1565."

[1] *i.e.*, Sunday, 17th March.
[2] *i.e.*, Monday, 18th March.

This letter explains itself, and needs no comment. The list of the names which was pinned to it is as follows. It bears this endorsement in the hand of Cecil's clerk:—

"Martii, 1565.

"Names of such as were consenting to the death of David.

"The Earl Morton.
The L. Ruthven.
The L. Lindsay.
The Secretary.
The Mr of Ruthven.
Lairds
Ormiston.
Brunston.
Haughton.
Lochleven.
Elphinston.
Patrick Murray.
Patrick Ballantyne.
George Douglas.
Andrew Car of Fawdonside.
John Knox, } Preachers.[3]
John Craig, }

"All these were at the death of Davy and privy thereunto, and are now in displeasure with the Q. and their houses taken and spoiled."[4]

The inference from all this seems to me inevitable—namely, that, in an

[3] Spelt thus in original:—
Th'erle Murton.
The L. Ryven.
The L. Lynnesey.
The Secreatory.
The Mr of Ryven.
Lards
Ormeston.
Bryanston.
Haughton.
Loughlyvine.
Elvingston.
Patrick Murry.
Patrick Ballentyne.
George Duglas.
Andro Kar of Fawdonsyde.
John Knox, } Preachers.
John Crag, }

[4] It is certain that this cannot mean that all whose names are to be found in this list were personally present at the act of the murder; it should be understood to mean that "all these were at the murder of Davy *or* privy thereto."

authentic list sent to Secretary Cecil by Bedford and Randolph, the name of John Knox is given as one of those who were privy and consenting to the death of David Riccio. Now that these two persons, the Earl of Bedford and Randolph, were intimately acquainted with the whole details of the conspiracy, has been proved in the text.[1] To the proof there given I shall merely add part of a letter of Bedford to Cecil, written, it is to be observed, on the 11th of March, the unhappy man having been murdered on the evening of the 9th of March.

"After my hearty commendations—yesterday, in the morning, the Earl of Moray and the other lords, and the rest, entered into Scotland, and went that night to Edinburgh. . . . These lords make account to find great aid in Scotland, so as shortly things will fall out in more open sort than as yet, whereof from time to time you shall be advertised. . . . Since the writing hitherto, certain advertisement is come that David is despatched and dead. That it should be so you have heard before. The manner and circumstances thereof I will not now trouble you withal. By my next I hope I shall have somewhat else to say, and then will I write more at large. . . .

"F. BEDFORD.

"From Berwick this 11th March 1565."

The evidence, therefore, is direct and clear, and comes from those who must be esteemed the best witnesses in such a case. But there are other circumstances which strongly corroborate it, as far as Knox is concerned. The Reformer was then the great leader and adviser of the party of the Kirk. Riccio was regarded as its bitter enemy, an opponent of God, an oppressor and tyrant over God's people;[2] and we know that Knox conceived it lawful for private individuals to put such persons to death, provided all redress in the ordinary course of justice was rendered impossible.[3] "The truth is," says Dr M'Crie, in his reflections upon the death of Beaton, "he [Knox] held the opinion that persons who, by the commission of flagrant crimes, had forfeited their lives, according to the law of God, and the just laws of society, such as notorious murderers and tyrants, might warrantably be put to death by private individuals, provided all redress in the ordinary course of justice was rendered impossible, in consequence of the offenders having usurped the executive authority, or being systematically protected by oppressive rulers."[4]

Now, keeping this in mind, we find Morton and Ruthven, the leading conspirators, informing Cecil, in a letter from Berwick, written on the 27th March, that the great end proposed by them in the murder of Riccio was to prevent the universal subversion of religion within Scotland; and they add this remarkable sentence, "and to the execution of the said enterprise the most honest and most worthy were easily induced to approve, and fortify the king's deliberation in the premises; howbeit, in action and manner of execution, more were followed of the king's advice, kindled by an extreme choler, than we deliberated to have done."[5] Who, then, were these persons named here, "the most honest and most worthy?" Evidently none else than the heads of the Protestant party, Morton and Ruthven, Lethington, Lindsay, and Ochiltree, the Barons of Ormiston, Brunston, Calder, Hatton, Lochleven, and others in Scotland, with Cecil himself, and Bedford and Randolph, the great supporters of the Protestant cause in England; and here it is to be noted that these Barons of Ormiston, Brunston, Calder, and Hatton were dear and intimate personal friends of Knox, whilst Ochiltree was his father-in-law. The Reformer, also, as we have seen, was the confidential correspondent of Bedford and Cecil, the associate in the common cause for the support of religion with Morton and Lethington, and undoubtedly the most powerful and influential of all the ministers or leaders of the Kirk. If called upon, therefore, to believe that the list which implicates him is a forged document, and that he had no foreknowledge of the murder of Riccio, we are to believe that in a plot formed by the party of which he was the leader, in which all his friends were implicated, the object of which was to support that form of faith which was dearer to him than life, by the commission of an act of which, from his avow-

[1] See p. 218 et seq.

[2] M'Crie's Life of Knox, by Dr Crichton, p. 253

[3] Ibid. pp. 25, 101, 171, 242.

[4] M'Crie's Life of Knox, by Dr Crichton, p. 27.

[5] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, 27th March 1565, Morton and Ruthven to Cecil.

ed principles, they knew that he would not disapprove,[1]—they studiously declined his assistance, concealed all that was to happen, and preferred, for the first time in their lives, to act without him. This supposition seems to me, I confess, untenable; and when I find Bedford and Randolph transmitting his name as one of the conspirators to Cecil, I cannot escape from giving credit to their assertion.

Another corroboration of his accession to this conspiracy was his precipitate flight from Edinburgh with the rest of the conspirators, upon the threatened advance of the queen to the city. His colleague Craig, it is to be observed, who was afterwards accused by his parishioners as being too much a favourer of the queen, remained in the city; but Knox fled precipitately, and in extreme agony of spirit, to Kyle; and, as we have already seen, did not venture to return till the noblemen rose against the queen after the death of Darnley.[2] If he was not implicated, why did he take guilt to himself by flight?

There is a passage to be found in the manuscript history of Calderwood, which is worth noticing upon this point. It has been quoted by Dr M'Crie,[3] and is as follows:—"King James the Sixth, having found great fault with Knox for approving of the assassination of Riccio, one of the ministers said, that the slaughter of David, as far as it was the work of God, *was allowed by Mr Knox*, and not otherwise."[4] "Knox himself," adds Dr M'Crie, "does not make this qualification, when he mentions the subject incidentally." It is not clear, however, whether this sentence refers to Knox's allowance or approval of the murder before or after the deed. It is, lastly, to be remembered that Riccio was a Roman Catholic, consequently, in Knox's eyes an idolater; and that the Reformer and his party held that idolatry might justly be punishable by death. "Into this sentiment they were led," says Dr M'Crie, "in consequence of their having adopted the untenable opinion that the judicial laws given to the Jewish nation were binding upon Christian nations, as to all offences against the moral law."[5]

Such is the evidence which appears to me conclusive in support of the fact stated in the text. Let me now mention two circumstances which may be quoted in defence of Knox, and in proof of his innocence of this charge.

The first list, including Knox's name as one privy to Riccio's death, is, as we have seen, preserved in the State-paper Office, attached to a letter, dated 21st March. But there is another list in the British Museum, dated the 27th of March, which does not include the Reformer's name, or that of Craig, his colleague. It is in the handwriting of Randolph, and is entitled, "The names of such as were doers, and of council, in the late attempt for the killing of the secretary David, at Edinburgh, 9th March 1556; as contained in the account sent to the Council of England, by the Earl of Bedford, lieutenant of the north, and Sir Thomas Randolph, ambassador from England to Scotland at the time, dated at Berwick, 27th March 1566." This account or letter of the 27th of March has been printed from the original in the Cotton collection,[6] by Sir Henry Ellis, vol. ii. p. 207, along with the list of the names.

The second circumstance is this: when Morton and Ruthven fled to Berwick, and sent to Bedford a vindication of their proceedings, with the intent that he should communicate it to Cecil and Elizabeth, they positively denied that any of the ministers of Scotland were art and part in the conspiracy, and accused the Papists of having raised the report. "It is come to our knowledge (they say) that some Papists have bruited that these our proceedings have been at the instigation of the ministers of Scotland. We assure your lordship, upon our honour, that there were none of them art nor part of that deed, nor were participate thereof."[7]

And now it may be asked, Why do

[1] Dr M'Crie, in noticing Knox's flight from Edinburgh, after the murder, states that "it is probable he had expressed his satisfaction at an event which contributed to the safety of religion and the commonwealth, if not also his approbation of the conduct of the conspirators." M'Crie's Life of Knox, by Dr Crichton, pp. 253, 254.

[2] See his prayer added to his Answer to Tyrie, quoted in M'Crie's Life, Note G to period 8th.

[3] M'Crie's Life of Knox, by Dr Crichton, p. 254.

[4] Calderwood, MS. ad annum 1591.

[5] M'Crie's Life of Knox, by Dr Crichton, p. 246.

[6] Caligula, B. x. fol. 337.

[7] Harleian, No. 289, fol. 96, endorsed in Cecil's handwriting, "Copy of Instructions to my Lord of Bedford, from the Lords of Morton and Rewhen, (Ruthven,) 1566." This date of the year is not in Cecil's hand.

you reject the evidence of this second list, and why are we not to believe this solemn declaration, absolving the ministers of Scotland, and of course Knox with them, from all participation in the murder? To this I answer, that there is no evidence to raise doubt that the list given on the 21st March was written in good faith, while the event was yet new, after the arrival of Lord Ruthven, and without any object but that of transmitting information *to Cecil;* while that of the 27th March, sent *to the Council of England*, was carefully prepared after the failure of the conspiracy by the escape of the queen, and when the cautious and politic Morton had reached Berwick. That these lords would have an especial object in keeping the names of Knox and Craig out of the list is evidenced by the above extract, and that they would have little scruple to such a suppression is clear from the manner in which they submit their narrative to Cecil, to be amended and qualified at his pleasure. That the secretary of Elizabeth did modify and recast the story after the failure of the conspiracy, and with the approbation or by the directions of Elizabeth, is expressly asserted by one who appears to have had an intimate acquaintance with the whole plot against Riccio. "La Regina d'Inghilterra," says he, "quale era stata causa del tutto, intendendo la pace fra il Re e Regina di Scotia, s'attristo molto e fece scrivere per il suo Secretario Cecille, per tutto il regno, che la causa di tutto il suddetto, era perche il Re haveva trovato il detto Ricciolo a dormire con la Regina. Il che non fu mai vero."[1] The extent to which this modification and alteration was not only permitted, but invited, to be carried, may be gathered from a passage in a letter of Morton and Ruthven to Secretary Cecil, sending him their account of the conspiracy and murder.[2] "If [say they, alluding to their enclosed narrative] there be anything that be hardly written, that might have been *cuthit*[3] in gentler terms, we will most humbly request your honour *to supply us therein, to amend and qualify as your wisdom thinks good, anything that you think extreme or rudely handled.*—It is our meaning, after the return of your honour's answer *with this copy corrected*, if so you find good, to send copies of that matter in France, Scotland, and such other places needful, as shall be thought necessary for staying of false and untrue reports and rumours."—And lastly, it is quite evident, from a passage in Bedford's and Randolph's letter of the 27th March, giving the account of the murder, and sending the list of the names, that the chief authorities consulted, for both account and list, were Morton and Ruthven, whose object it was to suppress the names of the ministers which appeared in the first list.[4]

So far then as to the preference given of the first list to the second: but then comes the question, Why not believe Morton, when he states, upon his word of honour, that none of the ministers of Scotland were art and part of that deed? I answer, because according to Morton's notions, being art and part, or participate in any action or crime, was a totally different thing from being privy to it, or cognisant of it before it was committed. Morton, according to the distinction which he made on his own trial, might have asserted with perfect honour that neither Knox nor any of the ministers were participate in Riccio's murder, and yet he may have been perfectly aware that Knox was privy to the murder, knew that it was about to be committed, and, according to the expression used to the king by one of their number, allowed of it, that is, gave a silent consent to it, so far as he considered it to be the work of God, for the destruction of an enemy of the truth and an idolater.—I say confidently, Morton made this distinction, because he tells us so himself in his own trial and subsequent confession. "When," says Spottiswood,[5] "the Earl of Montrose, Chancellor of the Assize, declared him [Morton] convicted of counsel, concealing, and being art and part, of the king's murther, at these last words he shewed himself much grieved, and beat-

[1] Avvisi di Scotia. See postea, p. 403.

[2] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, Morton and Ruthven to Cecil, Berwick, 2d April 1566. Endorsed by Cecil's clerk, "Earl Morton and Lord Ruthven to my Mr, with the Discourse touching the killing of David."

[3] Expressed.

[4] Bedford and Randolph say, "Having conferred the reports from abroad, which came to our knowledge, with the sayings of those noblemen, the *Lord Morton and the Lord Ruthven, that are present*, and of them all, that which we have found nearest to the truth, or, as we believe, the truth itself, have here put them in writing."—27th March 1566.—Ellis, vol. ii.

[5] Spottiswood, p. 313.

ing the ground once or twice with a little staff he carried in his hand, said, '*Art and part, art and part! God knoweth the contrary.*'"—"Then it was said to him, Apparently, my lord, ye cannot justly complain of the sentence that is given against you, seeing that with your own mouth ye confess the foreknowledge and concealing of the king's murder.—He answered, I know that to be true, indeed: but yet they should have considered the danger that the revealing it would have brought to me at that time. . . And howbeit they have condemned me of art and part, foreknowledge, and concealing of the king's murder, yet, as I shall answer to God, *I never had art or part, red or counsel, in that matter. I foreknew, indeed, and concealed it*, because I durst not reveal it to any creature for my life."[1]

It is perfectly clear, therefore, that Morton's declaration, that none of the ministers of Scotland were art and part of Riccio's murder, does not necessarily imply any declaration that Knox had not a foreknowledge of the murder; on the contrary, it is quite consistent with his having known it, and, according to the term used by one of his brethren to James, allowed of it.[2]

No. XVII., page 234.

Joseph Riccio and Joseph Lutyni.

Joseph Riccio, the brother of David Riccio, came into Scotland with Monsieur de Mauvissiere early in April 1566;[3] on the 26th April he was made secretary in his brother's place; and on the 20th June Drury informed Cecil that he was growing apace into favour. Joseph Lutyni was a gentleman in the Scottish queen's service, an intimate friend of Joseph Riccio.[4]

On the 23d January 1566-7, Sir William Drury addressed the following letter to Cecil:—

DRURY TO CECIL.

"*Berwick*, 23*d January* 1566.

"Right Honourable,—As this bearer, Mr Throckmorton, hath, by some necessary business of his own, occasion to repair to the court, so have I something not unmeet to advertise, which is, that at my arrival here, my Lord of Bedford being departed, I found here one Joseph [Lutyni] an Italian, and a gentleman who had served the Queen of Scots, and depesched with her good favour and license towards France, about certain of her grace's affairs, as by the copy of his passport, accompanied herewith, may appear; who taking this town in his way, through weak constitution of health, made his stay here for his better recovery; in which meantime I received a letter from the Queen of Scots, purporting a request to apprehend and stay him, for that he had, against the laws, taken goods and money from some of his fellows, as by the copy of the letter sent herewith your honour may be informed at length, which since, as appeareth by one that pursueth him, the queen's tailor, is but upon some old reckoning between them; and therefore giveth me to think, by that I can gather as well of the matter as of the gentleman, that it is not it that the queen seeketh so much as to recover his person. For, as I have learned, the man had credit there; and now the queen mistrusteth lest he should offer his service here in England, and thereby might, with better occasion, utter something either prejudicial to her, or that she would be loath should be disclosed but to those she pleaseth. Whereupon I have thought good to stay the man till such time as the queen's majesty's pleasure, or my lords of the council, be signified unto me, which the sooner it be the more shall the poor stranger be eased.

"The occurrents are,—the Lord Darly lyeth sick at Glasgo of the small pocks, unto whom the queen came yesterday: that disease beginneth to spread there. The Lord Morton lyeth at the Lord of Whytinghame's, where the Lord Bodwell and Ledington came of late to visit. He standeth in good terms for his peace. Here we look for Ledington or Melvyn very shortly to repair. This evening arrived here the ambassador of Savoy, Monsieur de Morett. The return this way of Monsieur le Croc is also looked for here. Thus having nothing farther to trouble your honour, I humbly take my leave. From Berwick, this 23d January 1566.[5]

"WILLIAM DRURY."

[1] Bannatyne's Memorials, p. 319.

[2] M'Crie's Life of Knox, by Dr Crichton, p. 254.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, April 20, 1566.

[4] Ibid, June 20, 1566.

[5] State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil.

Endorsed by Cecil's clerk, "*Mr Drury, marshal of Berwick, to my Mr* ——— *23d January* 1566."

We hear no more of this Italian till the 7th February 1566-7, when Drury wrote as follows to Cecil on the subject:—

DRURY TO CECIL.

"*Berwick, February* 7, 1566-7.

"It may please your honour to be advertised.—This day, immediately after my letter despatched to the L. Lethington, in answer of one of the queen's and another of his, tending both to one effect, for the delivery of the Italian Joseph, the very copy whereof I send herewith, I received even then one from your H. of the last of January, mentioning some direction of answer concerning the said Italian." Drury proceeds to state that he had not been able to find out from the stranger any matter of much moment. He then adds, "He (the Italian) doubteth much danger; and so affirmeth unto me that if he return, he utterly despaireth of any better speed than a prepared death."[1]

On the 19th of February 1566-7, Drury again thus wrote, touching the same Italian, to Cecil:—

DRURY TO CECIL.

"*Berwick, February* 19, 1566-7.

"It may please your H. to be advertised that I have received your letter of the 13th the 18th of this present, I having before returned the Italian to the queen, sending a gentleman with him, as well to see him safely delivered unto her, as to put the L. of Ledington in mind both of the queen's promise, whereof I doubted not, as of his own, that satisfying the debt, he should be in safety returned or restored to his liberty."[2] . . .

Lastly, on the 28th February 1566-7, Drury addressed a letter to Cecil, giving in its first paragraph, which follows, the sequel of the Italian's story, his return to Scotland, his examination by Bothwell, and his courteous dismissal:—

DRURY TO CECIL.

"It may please your honour to be advertised that the Italian here stayd, which the Queen of Scots by her letters required, I did send him unto her by a lieutenant of this garrison. She saw him not, but caused the Earl Bodwell to deal with him, who offered him fair speech to have him to tarry, which he would not yield unto; he satisfied such debt as the tailor could demand of him, others demanding of him nothing. The queen willed to give him 30 crowns, and hath returned him again unto me, who minds to-morrow to take his journey towards London, very well contented, as he seemeth, to have left Scotland."[3]

Having thus given all the letters which relate to this obscure matter, in order that the reader may form his own opinion, I conclude this note by the letter of Joseph Riccio to Joseph Lutyni, the Italian in question, part of which has been quoted in the text. It is endorsed by Cecil thus, "*Joseph Riccio, the Queen of Scots' servant.*"

JOSEPH RICCIO TO JOSEPH LUTYNI.

"SIGNOR JOSEPH,

"Io ho ditto a la Regina e a Thimoteo che voi m'havete portato via i miei denari, e la causa che io lo ditto e per quel, che voi intenderete.

"Quando noi fumo tornati di Starlino Thimoteo domando dove erano i vostri cavalli e le vostre robbe. Io li dissi che le vostre robbe erano drento il vostro coffano, e Lorenso Cagnoli li disse che voi havevi portato tutto con voi, insieme coni vostri cavalli, e che voi l'havete ditto, 'io ho bene abuzato il segretario perche pensa che le miei robbe siano drento il mio coffano, ma non ve nienté.'

"Quando Thimoteo intese questo comincio a dire, 'Cosi m'havete abuzato, Mr Segretario, la regina me ne fara la' ragione," e cosi trova Bastia e lo fa dire a la Regina, ch'io l'havevo assicurato, che voi eri andato per suoi affari, e che su quello m'haveva prestato cento scudi, e tutti cominciorno a dire che li era qualche cattivaria, e chio la sapeva e che voi havevi buttato le mani nelli pappieri della Regina; e io, che non voleva esser suspessionato, comincio a dire che voi m'havevi portato via sei Portoghese, e cinque nobili, e che m'havete promisso di mi lassare i vostri cavalli, e la Regina subbito mi dimanda 'Dove sono i miei braccialetti?' e io li dissi che voi li havevi portati conesso voi, e che erano drento la borsa con i

[1] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., Drury to Cecil, 7th Feb. 1566-7.

[2] Ibid., Feb. 19, 1566-7.

[3] MS. Letter, State-paper Office, B.C., 28th February 1566-7.

miei denari, e Bastia comincia a dire che voi li dovevi sesanta franchi, e cominciano a dire tutti, bisogna mandarli appresso, e fanno tanto, che la Regina comanda a Ledinton di fare una lettera per vi fare arrestare per camino.

"In questo mezo, Monsieur di Moretta e arrivato qui, il quale dice che voi li havete ditto, che io ero causa, che voi fate questo viaggio.—Pigliate guardia come voi havete parlato, perche se voi dite per quello che andavi, noi sareme tutti dui in gran pena. Io ho sempre ditto che voi eri andato per pigliar denari, e per lassar passar la collera della regina che l'haveva contra di voi, e chio vi haveva consigliato cosi, e chio vi haveva prestato denari per far questo viaggio, la somma di sesanta scudi e due Portoghese, perche ancora voi potrete dir cosi, e io o ditto che i denari che voi m'havete portato, per che voi me li avette resi quando voi fussi tornato di francia; e cosi voi et io saremo tutti due scusati. E se voi fate altramente voi sarete causa della mia ruuina, e penso che voi non mi vorreste vedere in ruuina. Per l'amor di dio fate come s'io fussi vostro figluolo, e vi prego per l'amor di dio e della buona amisitia che voi m'havete portata et io a voi, di dire come io vi mando, coe di fare questo viaggio per ritirare i vostri denari, e per lassar passar la collera a la Regina, e la sospittio che ella haveva di voi, e che i denari che io o ditto che voi m'havete pigliato, che voi l'havete pigliati per paura che nonvene mancasse per fare il vostro viaggio, e che voi me li haveste resi quando voi fussi tornato, e che non bisognava che io v'havessi fatto un tal brutto,[1] e che voi sete homo de bene, e che non li vorreste haver pigliati, sensa rendermeli, a causa che io ero tanto vostro compagno, voi non havette mai pensato che io ne havessi fatto un tal brutto. Et vi prego di non volere esser causa della mia ruuina, e se voi dite cosi come vi mando sarete scusato, e io ancora.

"La regina vi manda ci pigliare, per parlar; con voi pigliate guardia voi, che voi la conoscete, pigliate guardia che non v'abbuzi delle sue parole, come voi sapete bene; e m'ha detto che vuol parlare a voi in segreto, e pigilate guardia delli dire come vi ho scritto, e non altramente, a fin che nostra parola, si confronti l'una e l'altra, e ne voi ne io non saremo in pena nessuna, e vi prego di fare quanto v'ho scritto e non altramente. Fatemi intendere innanzi che voi siete qui, la vostra voluntà, et vi prego de haver pieta di me e non voler esser causa della mia morte, e facendo come io vi mando non sarete niente in pena ne io ancora, e io vene saro sempre obligato, e troverete chio lo conoscero d'una maniera, che voi vene contenterete di me, e vi prego di mi volere scrivere quello che voi volete dire, a fin che io non sia piu in questa pena che io sono innanzi che voi arrivate qui, per homo espress.

"Altra cosa non vo da scrivere per adesso, perche velo diro quando sarete qui, e vi prego di haver pieta di me, e di voi, perche se voi dite altramente di quel che io v'ho scritto, sarete in pena si ben come me.

"Pregando dio che vi dia contentezza di ed lilemburgh questa domenica.

"Vro come buon fratello,

"Joseph Riccio.

"Vi prego di brugiar la littera appresso che voi l'havete letta."[2]

[1] Sic in original.

No. XVIII., page 238.

Darnley's Murder.

I have stated the fact of the king having been strangled, and have added some new particulars regarding the murder, not only on the authority of a letter of Drury to Cecil, but from what I consider a still more unexceptionable piece of evidence, the assertion of Morett, the Savoy ambassador, who was on the spot, and had an opportunity of making himself acquainted with all the circumstances. As this point has been controverted, and some obscurity still hangs over the mode in which the murder was completed, I am happy to be able to publish the following curious and authentic extract from a letter, dated at Paris, 16th March 1567. It forms part of the collections of Prince Labanoff, the original being amongst the Medici papers, to which the prince had access. The letter was written by the Papal Nuncio, at Paris, to the Grand Duke; and after stating the arrival of Father Edmonds and Monsieur de Morett, the ambassador at Paris, with some other particulars, which I need not mention, it proceeds thus:—

"Quanto al particular della morte du quel Re, il ditto Signor di Moretta ha

[2] State-paper Office. The letter is thus endorsed in Cecil's hand, "Joseph Riccio, the Queen of Scots' servant."

ferma opinione, che quel povero Principe, sentendo il rumore delle genti che attorniavano la casa, e tentavano con le chiave false apprir gl'usci, volse uscir per una porta che andava al giardino in camicia, con la peliccia, per fuggire il pericolo, e quivi fu affogato, e poi condotto fuori dal giardino, in un piccolo horto fuori dalla muraglia della Terra, e che poi con il fuoco ruinassero la casa per amazzar il resto ch'era dentro, di che se ne fa conjettura percio che il Re fu trovato morto in camicia, con la peliccia a canto, et alcune donne che allogiavano vicino al giardino, affermano d'haver udito gridar il Re—'Eh fratelli miei habbiate pieta di me per amor di colui, che ebbe misericorda di tutto il mondo,' et il P. Edmondo m'afferma, che il Re questa mattina, haveva secondo il suo solito udita la messa, e che era stato sempre allevato della madre Cattolicamente ma che per desiderio di regnare alle volte dissimulava l'antica religione, se, cosi è'degni sua divina maesta haver misericordia di quella povera anima. . . .

"*Parigi*, 16 *de Marzo* 1567."

Collated and certified by the Archivista, G. Tanfani, 17th February 1840.

The following letters, from Drury to Cecil, give us some additional particulars relative to the murder of the king, and Bothwell's trial and conduct after it:—

DRURY TO CECIL.[1]

"*Berwick, February* 28, 1566-7.

"May it please your honour, &c. . . .

"There hath been other bills bestowed[2] upon the church doors, as upon a tree called the Tron, wherein they speak of a smith who should make the key, and offers, (so there might be assurance of the living that by proclamation was offered,) he and others will with their bodies approve these to be the devisers, and upon the same venture their lives.

"There was at the meeting at Dunkeld, the Earls Moray, Morton, Athole, and Caithness, the L. Oglebie, the L. Glammis, Lindsay, and others. John Hepburn, sometime captain under the Earl Bodwell of the Hermitage, is thought to be one of the executors of this cruel enterprise; there is one Hughe Leader also suspected. I am promised to understand the certainty. His servant, Sandy Duram, a Scottish man, is thought also to know some part. I will not write of so much as the Scots speak themselves, and some of them of credit.

"Standen and Nelson, with some others that served the Lord Darnley, as I hear, are referred for their wages to the Provost of Edinburgh. The Lord of Craigmillar, and the Earl Bodwell, hath promised to give Standen a horse. Hudson, a man of good years, with the rest of the musitianers, came this other day to Seton, to the queen, and required her licence that they might repair into their country. She dissuaded them to the contrary, saying unto them, You have lost a good master, but if you will tarry, you shall find me not only a good mistress, but a mother. But they mind again to move her, and, as I hear, minds to return. There is with her at Seton, Argyle, Huntly, Bodwell, and Livingston; the Lord Seton is gone to Newbottle, having left the whole house to the queen; so she is there of her own provision, and minds, as I am advertised, to tarry there till near unto Easter. There is in hand to have the lords assemble in Edinburgh. She hath twice sent for the Earl of Moray, who stayeth himself by my ladie in her sickness. It is said that the Lord Fleming shall be the Earl Bodwell's deputy at Alnwick, for suppression of the rebels of Liddesdale, and that certain of the soldiers are gone from Edinburgh to the Hermitage there to remain.

"There was a rich ship of Shetland, bound to Flanders, lost this last week at Holy Island, receiving a leak, coming from Leith. She was laden with fells, hides, and leaden ore. The Frenchmen that I wrote of in my last letters, that took shipping at Leith, have been put in by weather into the Holy Island, and there have remained these eight days past.

"Edward Collingwood, one of this garrison horsemen, is returned from the Earl Bodwell, having remained with him in Scotland this quarter of this year. I have upon respects committed him to ward: by my next letters your honour shall understand more. The gates of Seton are very straitly kept. Captain Cullen, with his company, have the credit nearest her person.

"The Earl of Bodwell was on Thursday at Edinburgh, where he openly declared, affirming the same by his oath, if he knew who were the setters up of the bills and writings, he would wash

[1] State-paper Office, B.C.

[2] Sic in original.

his hands in their blood. His followers, who are to the number of fifty, follow him very near. Their gesture, as his, is of the people much noted. They seem to go near and about him, as though there were that would harm him; and his hand, as he talks with any that is not assured unto him, upon his dagger, with a strange countenance, as the beholders of him thinks. Even as the Lord Darnley, and his servant William Taylor, lay in the house in distance one from the other, even so, as also otherwise,[1] were they found together. Signior Francis, as I hear, minds to pass this way within six or eight days.

"I send your lordship here the copy of some of the bills set up, whereby you may see how undutifully the doers of the same doth behave themselves against their sovereign. I have thought it my part as well to send you this, as I have done in the rest, for that I would, if you should so think it meet that her majesty, my sovereign, should understand all that comes to my knowledge of the proceedings in these parts. The Lady Bodwell is, I am by divers means informed, extremely sick, and not likely to live. They will say there, she is marvellously swollen.—Even now is brought me that the queen came upon Wednesday at night to the Lord Whawton's[2] house, seven miles off this side; dined by the way at a place called Tranent, belonging to the Lord Seton, where he and the Earl of Huntly paid for the dinner, the queen and the Earl Bodwell having, at a match at shooting, won the same of them. There is a proclamation made in Edinburgh, forbidding all persons for raising up any of the stones or timber at the house where the L. Darnley was murdered. There is one of Edinburgh that affirms how Mr James Bafourde bought of him powder as much as he should have paid three score pounds Scottish, but he must parforme[3] it with oyle to that value. Bafourde came to Edinburgh upon Wednesday at night, accompanied to the Tower with thirty horsemen. When he was near unto the Tower, he lighted, and came in a secret way; [one] is now come to me of this Tower that saw him when he came—he is hateful to the people. This person of this Tower assures me also that yesterday, being Thursday, before he departed thence, he saw a bill, having been set up the night before, where were these letters written in Roman hand, very great, M. R., with a sword in a hand near the same letters; then an L. B., with a mallet near them, which mallet, they, in their writing, called a mell. These being even now brought me, and affirmed by him that saw it, I have also thought it my part to advertise your honour of, that her maj., my sovereign, may know all that passes, as much as comes to my knowledge, wherein I think I do my duty; which, if I understand from you that it be not so taken, I shall cease from it, and do according to your direction; for I only desire from your honour that I may from time to time receive your advice how best I may here employ my time to deserve her majesty's favour and liking. How I have spent my time sithence my last coming, in remedying of things needful for her highness's service, your honour may by others understand.

"I have received divers requests made unto me by them that hath come from Scotland for the receiving of Standen and his company. I have answered, I will neither advise them to come, nor promise them any favour; and minds, if they come, to commit them to ward, till I understand from you her majesty's pleasure, which it may please you to signify unto me.

"The L. of Cessford and Fernyhirst, with the chief of both parties, are now at Edinburgh, for the continuance of the agreement amongst them, which agreement, as it is thought, will breed no great good to the queen's maj. my sovereign her subjects upon the Borders; for the being agreed, they will rob and spoil faster by their reding.[4] . . . &c.

"W. Drury."

[1] Sic. in original. There must be some mistake in Drury's mode of expressing himself, as the text implies a contradiction.

[2] Probably Hawton.

[3] Parfume.

No. XIX., page 243.

Bothwell's Trial.

The following is the letter to Cecil, alluded to in the text:—

Drury to Cecil.[5]

"15*th April* 1567.

"Right Honble,—The queen's majesty's letter, directed to the Queen of

[4] *By their reding, i.e.*, by their agreement—in consequence of their agreement they will be able to rob the faster.

[5] State-paper Office, B.O

Scots, I received the 11th hereof, at x of the clock, which forthwith I discharged by the Provost Marshal here, who in mine opinion was not the unmeetest I could choose for the purpose.

"He arrived at the court the 12th, at six in the morning, and then used his diligence immediately to deliver his letter, which he had in charge, to the queen, attending some good space in court, procuring all that he might by the means of such as were near her person, who told him it was early, and that her majesty was asleep, and therefore advised him to tarry some time thereabouts, till she arose, which he did, going out of the court into the town, and shortly after returned, she being not yet risen, and therefore walked about till nine or almost ten o'clock, when all the lords and gentlemen were assembled taking their horse; and then, thinking his opportunity aptest, going into the court as a little before he did, (the contents of the letter he brought being conjectured and bruted to be for stay of the assize,) was denied passage into the court in very uncourteous manner, not without some violence offered; which, seeing he could not be permitted to have recourse as all other persons, whatsoever they were, he requested that some gentleman of credit would undertake faithfully to deliver his letter, from the queen's majesty of England, to the queen their sovereign, which none would seem to undertake.

"Upon this came unto him the Parson of Oldhamestock, surnamed Hepborne, who told him that the Earl Bodwell had sent him with this message, 'that the earl, understanding he had letters for the queen, would advise him to retire him to his ease, or about some other his business, for the queen was so molested and disquieted with the business of that day, that he saw no likelihood of any meet time to serve his turn till after the assize.'

"Then came the Lord of Skirling, who asked him if his letter were either from the Council or the queen's majesty: he told him from the queen's majesty only. Then, said he, ye shall be soon discharged; and so returning into the court, desired the said person to keep him company at the gate, which he did; and there with espying a Scottish man whom he had for his guide, took occasion to reprehend and threaten him of hanging, for bringing English villains as sought to and procured the stay of the assize, with words of more reproach.

"In this instant Ledington was coming out, and Bodwell with him, at the which all the lords and gentlemen mounted on horseback, till that Ledington came to him demanding [of] him the letter, which he delivered. Then Bodwell and he returned to the queen, and stayed there within half an hour, the whole troop of lords and gentlemen still on horseback attending for his coming. Ledington seemed willing till have passed by the Provost without any speech; but he pressed towards him, and asked him if the queen's majesty had perused the letter, and what service it would please her majesty to command him back again.

"He answered that as yet the queen was sleeping, and therefore had not delivered the letters, and thought that there would not be any meet time for it till after the assize, wherefore he willed him to attend; so giving place to the [throng] of people that passed, which was great, and by the estimation of men of good judgment above 4000 gentlemen besides others. The Earl Bodwell passed with a merry and lusty cheer, attended on with all the soldiers, being 200, all harkebuzers, to the Tolbooth, and there kept the door, that none might enter but such as were more for the behoof of the one side than the other. The assize began between x and xi, and ended vii in the afternoon.

"The Earl of Argyle and Huntly [were] chief judges. What particularly was done or said there, I cannot yet learn, more than that there were two advocates called Crawford and Cunningham, for the Earl of Lennox, who accused the Earl Bodwell for the murder of the king, alleging certain documents for the same, and desiring forty days' term longer, for the more perfect and readier collection of his proofs."

There is another original letter of Drury's written about this time, which is a fragment, and without the date of month or day. It consists of disjointed pieces of news sent from Scotland by some one of those many spies from whom Drury received information. "The guard," says he, "of the soldiers of Bodwell, he going to be tried by the assize, and their keeping of the door, is much misliked of." "Bothwell, immediately after the trial, set up a cartel of defiance; he would fight

any one (except a defamed person) who accused him of the king's death. If I thought it might stand with the queen my sovereign her favour, I would answer it and commit the sequel to God. I have for me sufficient to charge him with, and would prove it upon his body, as willingly as I would receive the obtaining of my sute, required of the queen's majesty. I have here caused the draught of a letter to her majesty, humbly craving your honour's judgment of it. The marriage of the queen to Bodwell, and the death of the prince, is presently looked for. I send you here inclosed the ploughman's bill, if your honour shall think it good to shew it to her majesty. There is another worse, which I am promised.

"The cardinal did send a very gentle letter to the Lord of Moray by Clarenock, also credit by mouth, craving pardon for the past, for that he had borne him evil will; but now, finding that though his religion were contrary to his, yet his honest, honourable doings, and the care that he was now surely persuaded he hath tofore had of this queen here, and his sound dealing with her, ever moved him now to think himself beholden unto him. Monsieur de Croc seems much to mislike the earl's departure, and says so to the queen. She answered, he went away for debt; but she wept at his departure, wishing he were not so precise in religion. She wished him to go to Flanders, and to visit neither England nor France.

"It was Captain Cullen's persuasion, for more surety, to have the king strangled, and not only to trust to the train of powder, affirming he had known many so saved. Sir Andro Carr, with others, was on horseback near unto the place, for aid to the cruel enterprise if need had been. The Lady Coldingham, now wife to the young Mr of Caithness, and sister to the Earl Bodwell, is in credit, and in the place of the Lady Renes, now out of court. Suspicion banished the one and placed the other. I dare not say as others that knows more says.

"Great means was used to have had the Earl of Moray staid in the town till the cruel deed had been done. The Bishop of Glasco, Ambassador for Scotland in France, hath written to the queen, and to others which the queen hath understanding of, that nothing likes her, of the death of the king. . . . The king was long of dying, and to his strength made debate for his life. The Lord David, son to the duke, is mad, and Arbroath, his brother, hath already had a show of the same disease. . . . There accompanied the Earl of Moray to the boundary his brother the Lord of Holyrood House, the Lord Hume, and the chief of the gentlemen of the March, and some of Lothian, as Brymstone and others. The king would often read and sing the 55th Psalm, and went over it a few hours before his death. There were not many that he would of his griefs deal with, but to some he would say he should be slain, and complain him much of his being hardly dealt with. Even now by the under-marshal I received this more. His own evil handling. He only kept out of the court pushed out as it were by force, thrust upon the breast with extremity, in the sight of divers gentlemen, which seemed much to mislike therewith.

"A bill set up, 'Farewell, gentyll Henry, but a vengeance of Mary.' The queen sent a token and message to Bodwell being at the assize.[1] The queen, upon Thursday last, past through the street unto the market, where there were women sitting that had to sell. They rysse as she came near, crying aloud, 'God save your grace, if you be saikless of the king's deade [of the king's death.'] The queen's advocates, that should have inveighed against Bodwell, are much condemned for their silence. The like at an assize hath not been used. . . . Bodwell rode upon the courser that was the king's when he rode to the assize. The nobility long tarried his coming a horseback to accompany him. There was that followed him above iiii thousand, whereof the greatest part were gentlemen, besides they that were [in] the streets, which were more in number. The streets were full from the Canongate to the castle.

"Ledington and others told the under-marshal that the queen was asleep, when he himself saw her looking out at a window, shewed him by one of La Croke's servants, a Frenchman, and Ledington's wife with her; and Bodwell, after he was a horseback, looked up, and she gave him a friendly nod for a farewell; for till it was known the under-marshal's errand as the contents of the letter, he had liberty in

[1] By Drury to Cecil, Border Correspondence, 24th April 1567.

court; but not after, when he was once out, suffered to go in again."

No. XX., page 252.

Mary's Marriage with Bothwell.

It is remarked in the text, p. 252, that the queen, although making a show of contentment, was really wretched. The following letter of De Croc, the French ambassador, was written three days after her marriage with Bothwell, but recounts an interview which the ambassador had with Mary on her marriage-day. It is taken from the MS. Collections of Prince Labanoff. The original is in the Bibliotheque Royale at Paris. Collection de Harlay, No. 218.

"*Depeche de Monsieur de Croc a Catherine de Medicis, du* 18 *Mai*, 1567.

"Madame,—Les lettres que j'escript a V. M. par le dit Evesque (de Dumblane) sont pour estre leues; Vous pouvez penser que je ne me fye a lui quoi que je vous escrive. Vos Majestes ne sauraient mieux faire que de luy faire mauvaise chere, et trouvez bien mauvaise le mariage, car il est tres malheureux, et desja l'on n'est pas à s'en repenter. Ieudi, Sa majeste m'envoya quërir, on je m'apperceus d'une estrange façon entre elle et son Mary, ce que elle me voullut excuser, disant que si je la voyois triste, c'estoit pour ce qu'elle ne voulloit se rejouyr comme elle dit ne le faire jamais, ne desirant que la mort.[1]

"Hier estant renfermez tous deux dedans un cabinet avec le Compte de Bodwell, elle cria tout hault, que on luy baillast ung couteau pour se tuer. Ceulx qui estoient dedans la chambre, dans la piece qui precedoit le Cabinet, l'entendirent. Ils pensent que si Dieu luy aide qu'elle se desespera. Je l'ay conseillè et comfortée de mieux que j'ay peu ces trois fois que je l'ay veu.

"Son Mary ne la fera pas longue, car il est trop hay en ce royaume et puis l'on ne cessera jamais que la mort de Roy ne soyt seüe. Il n'ya ici pas un seul Seingneur de Nom, que le dit Compte de Bodwell et le Compte de Craffort; les autres sont mandés, et ne veullent point venir.

"Elle a envoyé qu'ils s'assemblent en quelque lieu nommè, et je les aille trouver pour leur parler au nom du Roy, et voir si je y pourrez faire quelque chose. Sil advient j'y ferez tout ce qu'il me sera possible, et apres, le meilleur est de me retirer, et comme je vous ayt mander, les laisser jouer leur jeu. Il n'est point séant que je y sois au nom du Roy; Car si je favorise la Royne l'on pensera en ce Royaume, et en Angleterre, que le Roy tient la main à tout ce qui se fait, et si ce n'eust estè le commandement que V. M. me feyrent, je fust party huict jours devant les nopces. Si est ce que j'ay parlez bien hault, dequoy tout ce royaume est assez abberuvez,[2] et je ne me suis point voullu brasser[3] a ses nopces; ni depuis ne l'ay point voullu recongnoistre comme Mary de la Royne. Je croiz qu'il escrira à V. M. par le dit Evesque de Dumblane; Vous ne luy debvez point faire de responce," &c. &c.

[1] This conversation, it is to be particularly noted, occurred on the very day of Mary's marriage to Bothwell—the 15th of May.

No. XXI., page 285.

Mary's Escape from Lochleven.

The following minute account of the queen's escape from Lochleven, which is my authority for the new and interesting circumstances given in the text, was communicated by John Beaton, brother of the Archbishop of Glasgow, to the King of France, and transmitted by Petrucci, the envoy or ambassador of the Grand Duke, Cosmo de Medicis, to his master, in a letter dated at Paris, 21st of May 1568. It is taken from the MS. Collections of Prince Labanoff, who found the original in the secret archives of the House of Medici. Beaton, it will be observed, was on the spot watching at Kinross for the queen on the evening she made her escape. He was a principal contriver of the escape, and an eye-witness and ear-witness of all.

MODO CHE LA REGINA DI SCOTIA HA USATO PER LIBERARSI DALLA PRIGIONE.

Advisato detta Regina di Scotia Monsignor di Seton suo confidentissimo Cattolico et molto valoroso cavaliere, per via d'un putto di casa, il quale non ritorno poi, egli si condusse per il giorno diterminato con circa 50 cavalli, presso al Lago di Loclevin, dove la Regina era tenuta prigioniera, restando pero egli con 40 di loro, fra certe montagne poco lontano per non essere

[2] Instruit. [3] Participer.

scoperti da quelli del Castello del lago, e piu presso si fecero gli altri dieci, che smontarono in un vilaggio vicino al lago, mostrando esservi per transito, uno de quali ando in ripa al lago prossimo, et stava col corpo disteso in terra per non esser veduto, aspettando, che la Regina uscisse, secondo l'ordine.

"Alla porta del Castello, si facevano le guardie continuati, giorno e notte, eccetto che mentre ci cenava, nel qual tempo, si chiudeva la Porta con una chiave, andando ogniuno a cena, e la chiave stava sempre sulla tavola, dove il Castellano mangiava, e davanti a lui. Il Castellano è fratello uterino del Conte de Murray Regente de Scozia, fratello naturale della Regina, e suo mortal nimico.

"La Regina doppo provato di calarsi da una finestra, e non li era riuscito, fece tanto che un paggio del Castellano, il quale essa haver a cio disposto, portando la seconda sera di Maggio un piatto in tavola, con una servietta innanzi al padrone, le misse sopra la chiave, e quella tolse e porto via—che alcuno non s'en'accorse, andato subito dalla Regina le disse il tutto, e ella che tra tanto s'era messe le vesti della maggior di quelle due cameriere, che le havevano lassate, menando seco per mano la minore, che puo essere una figlia di 10 anni, n'ando col paggio chetamente alla porta et aperta se n'usci con lui, e con la putta, e serrata la per di fuori con la medesima chiave, senza laquale non si poteva aprire, ne anco di dentro, entra in un piccol batello, che quivi si teneva per servizio del Castello, è spiegato un suo velo bianco, con un fiocco rosso, fe il segno concertato, a chi l'attendeva che ella veniva, al quale segno quello che era disteso in terra su la ripa del lago, levato si, e con un altro segno advisati li Cavaliere del Vilaggio, (fra quali era principale, quello che e venuto qua a dar conto di questo fatto a questi Maesta, che e fratello del Ambasciatore di Scotia qua,) e da loro advisati poi quelli della Montagna furono subito al lago, e la Regina che col paggio remando al meglio che poteva, di la con la Dio gratia s' era condotta; racolsero con infinita allegrezza e messa la a cavallo, col paggio e con la putta, la menarono al Mare 5 miglia indi discosto, per cio che l'andare sempre per terra, dove havevano disegnato saria stato loro di manifesto pericolo.

"Imbarcatisi tutti la condussero a Nidri luogo ti Monsignore di Seiton e di la poi a Amilton, Castello del Duca di Sciatelero, la dove Monsignore d'Arcivescovo di Santa Andrea suo fratello, con altri principali de quella parte l'accolsero e rivererono come Regina. Amilton e luogo forte per battaglia di mano e vicino a Don Bertran porto e Castello fortissimo 4 leghe, ma la Regina non si retira la' si perche e ben sicura in Amilton, comandando a tutta quella contrada, Monsignor S'Andrea sudetto, e non altri, si per poter recever meglio quei che anderano ad-adjutarla la, che in una fortezza forse non saria cosi, alla quale pero in ogni caso si puo condurre da una sera, a un altra accadendo.

"Tutto quel regno e in moto, chi per la Regina, chi contro di lei col Conte di Moray—Ella ha mandato questo Gentilhuomo[1] a domandar per hora mille archebusieri a queste Maesta, ma che se vorra ricuperare, Edinburg, citta principale, e l'altre fortezze occupate da ribelli, hara bisogno d'esser adjutata da ogni banda, he ha scritta una lettera al Cardinale di Loreno che moveria ogni cuore duro a compassione di lei, et le prime linee sono che ella domanda perdona a Dio et al Mondo di gli errori passati della sua giovinezza, che ricognosci la sua liberazione solo da sua divina Maesta, e che le ne rendeva, humilissime gratie, che le habbia dato tanto spirito in queste sue afflitioni, che non si sia mai punto mossa dal suo fermo proponimento di voler vivere e morir Cattolica, come intende hora de voler far piu che mai."

Collated and signed by L'Archivista, G. Tanfani.

Dal Archivio Mediceo, le 17 *Febbrajo* 1840.

In a letter, preserved amongst the Morton MSS., from Sir William Kirkaldy to the Laird of Lochleven, dated June 1, 1568, there is the following passage:—

"Seeing that all thir three taik no effect, this last was tane in hand and executed, devised by the queen's self, George, and the lad Willie, and Cursell was on the counsel, who received all writings, messages, and tokens from Willie sent by George to the queen. I can try no more of your servants to have been on this counsel. . . . As to them that came in company with the L. Seton, I need not tell you their names; but James Wardlaw was the

[1] Namely, John Beaton.

guide, and laid them quietly in the hill, where they might see the going in and out of the boat. When I know farther, ye shall understand it," &c. 1st June 1568.

No. XXII., page 286.

Battle of Langside.

The following account of this battle is taken from an original in the State-paper Office, entitled,—

"ADVERTISEMENTS OF THE CONFLICT IN SCOTLAND."

[The blanks are left in consequence of the original being in those places injured.]

"16*th May* 1568.

"The queen's number was six thousand.

"The Earl of Argyle her Lieutenant-General.

"The company of the Lords was esteemed to be four thousand.

"The Hamiltons had the vauntgarde of the queen's part, assisted with others, to the number of two thousand. Both companies did strive for a hill nigh adjoining where they met. Their meeting together was in a strait passage through a village. The Lord Hume, the Lord Semple, and the Lord Morton, had the vauntgarde on that side. The fight endured, at the least, three quarters of an hour without giving back. The queen's party first gave way, and then pursued[1] . . . at the beginning of which chase Th' Earl of Moray willed and required all his to spare for shedding of more blood. Otherwise as many as were on foot, which were the greatest number, had been in their enemy's will, for the h . . . whereof the Lord Harris was general, fled and . . . within the horses of them that were lighted of the company.

"The queen beheld this conflict within half a mile distant, standing upon a hill, accompanied with Lord Boyd, the Lord Fleming, and the Lord Harris' son, with thirty others, who, seeing the company overthrown, took the way to[2] [Dumbarton, who was so near pursued that she could not take the boat that should bring her into Dumbarton, but was driven to take the way to Dumfries, where she as yet remaineth.] The estimation of the number that was slain in the place where they fought, by the view of them that have skill, is judged to be six or seven score, besides those have died since being brought into the town and other places, which daily die. And taken prisoners of that side to the number of 300 and more, whereof the Lord Seton, the Lord Ross, Sir James Hamilton, the Mr Montgomery, the Mr Cassillis, the Sheriff of Ayr, the Sheriff of Lithgow, who bore the Hamilton's standard in the vantgarde, himself being a Hamilton, the young Laird of Preston, the Laird of Innerwick, the Laird of Pitmilly, and the Laird of Baweirg, Andro Melvin, the Laird of Boyne, and Robert Melvin, Captain Anstruther, the Laird of Trabrowne, two sons to the Bishop of St Andrews, if one of them not slain, a son to the Abbot of Kylwinnon. The rest of the number that is taken of the three hundred is all of the surname of the Hamiltons and their allya. Alexr. Stewart a captain of footmen slain.

"John Hamilton of Millbourne, Mr of the household to the Duke, also slain. John Hamilton of Ormiston slain.

"The prisoners for the most part are all put in the castle of Glasgow. Of the Lords' side never a man of name slain. Divers sore hurt. The Lord Hume hurt in the leg and face, and overthrown, and relieved by his own men. The Lord Ochiltree sore hurt, and in danger of his life, at the skirmish on horseback in the morning, receiving his chief wound with a sword in his neck, given by the Lord Harris, whose son, in the revenge of his father's hurt, had slain the Lord Seton, had not the Earl of Moray saved him, after his being yielded. Andro Kar of Fawdonside likewise hurt in danger of his life, with divers other gentlemen sore hurt.

"The Earl of Argyle, even as they were joining, as it is reported, for fault of courage and spirit, swooned. There were divers of the queen's part taken, and not brought in, for there was the father against the son, and brother against brother, as namely, three of the Melvyns of the Lords' side, and two of the queen's, which was Robert and Andro. After the fight had long continued, a gentleman of the Highland, called Macfarlane, who not xx days before for his misbehaviour was condemned to die, and yet, at the suit of the Countess of Moray, had his pardon, and now accompanied with two hun-

[1] Sic in original.

[2] The passage enclosed with [ ] is scored through in the original.

dred of his countrymen was a wing to the vauntgarde of th' east side, and came in and executed great slaughter, by whom the victory was not thought least to be atchieved.

"The Earl of Huntly was coming to the queen with . . . with great speed, untill . . . . . got the warst, and then . . . of field pieces of brass there was x, which the Lords also wan. And the Mr Gunner, with a great piece from the Lords' side.

"The day following, being the 14th, the earl sent to summon the castle of Hamilton. The answer respaited till the next morning, and he that had the charge thereof came to Glasgow, and offered the keys to the Earl of Moray upon his knees, and said, that if it pleased to send any thither to receive it, he should; and he answered that he would go himself, and so did, and took it that day himself about 12 hours; and within few hours afterwards went to Draffen, but how he hath therein prevailed I yet know not, but shall at the return of those two that I have yet remaining there.

"The Earl of Athole, notwithstanding his promise made to the Lords, neither he nor any of his came. The Laird of Grange had the charge of the horsemen of the Lords' side, who that day played his part. The French ambassador was either at Hamilton or in the field the day of their meeting. The Earl of Eglinton, being of the queen's side, bestowed himself in a house, and there covered with straw till the night, and then escaped.

"The noblemen that were with the queen: the Earl of Argyle, th' Earl of Eglinton, the Earl of Cassillis's brother, with his friends. The Earl of Rothes, the Lord Boyd, the Lord Fleming, the L. Levyston, the Lord Seton, the Lord Ross, the Lord Yester, the Lord Borthwick, the Lord Claud, son to the Duke, Sir James Hamilton, . . . the Sheriff of Lithgow, the L. . . . and of Garleys, the L. Weemys of Fife, with all the whole force of Galloway and Liddesdale.

"That day the Earl of Moray went to receive the castle of Hamilton; certain of his horsemen ran a foray, and got many naggs, whereupon the poor people made a great lamentation, and immediately thereupon he caused proclamation to be made that their goods should be delivered again, and no spoil to be made."

No. XXIII., page 315.

An Order for Mary's Execution in 1569.

The following is the letter of Leicester, referred to in the text. It was politely communicated to me by John Bruce, Esq., a well-known and able antiquary, and secretary to the Camden Society. He conjectures that it was written to Secretary Walsingham, but the address does not appear on the letter. It is preserved in a MS. volume belonging to Frederick Ouvry, Esq., by whose permission it is now printed. The volume was written, as Mr Bruce conjectures, about the beginning of the seventeenth century, and contains transcripts of many letters written by Leicester, from the Low Countries. I have in vain searched for the original of this letter in the State-paper Office. The fact which it mentions, that a great seal was sent for Mary's execution of a sudden, at the time of Northumberland and Westmoreland's rebellion, is, as far as I know, new.

LEICESTER TO ———.

10*th October* 1585.

"I have written very earnestly, both to her majesty and my Lord Treasurer, and partly also to yourself and Mr Vice-Chamberlain, for the furtherance of justice in [on] the Queen of Scots; and believe me if you shall defer it, either for a parliament or a great session, you will hazard her majesty more than ever; for time to be given is that the traitors and enemies to her will desire.

"Remember, how upon a less cause, how effectually all the council of England once dealt with her majesty *for justice to be done upon that person*, for being suspected and infamed to be consenting with Northumberland and Westmoreland in the rebellion. You *know the Great Seal of England was sent then, and thought just and meet, upon the sudden, for her execution.* Shall now her consent and practice for the destruction of her majesty's person be used with more [regard] to her danger than the less found fault? Surely I tremble at it; for I do assure myself of a new more desperate attempt if you shall fall to such temporising solemnities; and her majesty cannot but mislike you all for it; for who can warrant these villains from her if that person live, or shall live any time? God forbid; and

be you all stout and resolute in this speedy execution, or be condemned of all the world for ever. It is most certain, if you will have her majesty safe, it must be done; for justice doth crave it, besides policy. It is the cause I send this poor lame man, who will needs be the messenger for this matter; he hath bidden such pain and travel here, as you will not believe. A faithful creature he is to her majesty as ever lived. I pray you let her not[1] retain him still now, even to save his life, for you know the time of the year is past for such a man to be in the field; yet will he needs be so, and means to return, and you must procure his stay as without my knowledge, or else I lose him for ever; but if he come hither, it is not like if he can continue; he deserves as much as any good heart can do—be his good friend, I pray you, and so God bless you—Hast—written in my bed upon a cushion, this 10th, early in the morning.

"Your assured.

"I pray you let not Candish know I wrote for his stay, but yet procure it in any wise."

No. XXIV., page 347.

Elizabeth's Plot for the Secret Execution of Mary in Scotland.

The following are the letters which contain the secret history of Killigrew's mission:—

HENRY KILLIGREW TO LORDS BURGHLEY AND LEICESTER.

"*Leith*, 14*th September* 1572.

"May it please your good lordships, I arrived at Berwick the 11th of this present; and after I had some conference with Mr Marshal touching my charge, I came to Tantallon, where the Earl Morton had lain sick ten days before. He caused me to stay there all night, by reason whereof many speeches passed, which now for haste I cannot enlarge; but, in sum, it may please your honour to know, that he assured me, that for his part he was the same man he always professed himself to be, both for the king his master's service, and the doing of all good offices to continue the amity with the queen's majesty, my sovereign; that he knew of no pensions offered by Monsieur de Croc, nor any practices for conveying the king, &c. La Croc he seemed not to like, because hitherto he did not acknowledge the king's authority; but a driver of time in this treaty, which I think will hardly be brought to a good peace without further trouble, for the great jealousy the one party hath that the other meaneth but drift of time. He[1] is the king's lieutenant-general on this side Stirling.

"The news of France doth make them and others startle, and here methinks doth greatly alienate their minds from that king. Where their day of meeting was appointed to be the 10th day of this month, certain of both sides convened together and put it off till the 20th of this month, at which time the regent, and the Earl of Morton, with the king's friends, do meet here in Leith. In this meanwhile, passing towards my Lord Regent to Stirling, I thought good, having met Mr James Melvin by chance in this town, to let them of the castle know of my coming, and of the cause, and of the charge I have to deliver them as soon as I shall have been with the regent. It seemeth I am not misliked of the other party, and therefore I hope some good will grow, even in the matter I am chiefly sent for, whereof, as soon as I may be able with reason, I shall advertise your honours; and in this meantime, most humbly beseech you to pardon this rude scribbling.

"John Knox is again in Edinburgh; the town guarded; and this also, which is somewhat fortified and in defence, with the king's soldiers. From Leith, this 14th of September, in the morning.[2]

"Your honours' most bounden,

"H. KILLIGREW."

KILLIGREW TO LORDS BURGHLEY AND LEICESTER.

"19*th October* 1572, *Stirling*.

"May it please your good lordships to be advertised. I came hither the 16th of this present, at night, and the next day I was bidden to dinner with the regent, and saw the king, who seemed to me a very toward prince of his age, both in wit and person.

"I pressed my Lord Regent's grace to command some good and reasonable

[1] Sic in original, but it seems incorrect. It should be, I think, "let her retain him still now."

[1] *i. e.*, Morton.

[2] State-paper Office.

answers to be made unto the form of surety demanded by the Castilians, to the end that this abstinence be not neglected as the other was, without doing anything for the peace until it was too late; and in this motion I used some speeches to sound his inward liking and devotion to the peace indeed, which I found him to my judgment most desirous thereof: and weary, as it were, in respect of the burden, charge, and trouble, sustained by the regiment, because he findeth not the assistance he looked for, neither at home, nor yet from abroad.

"Touching my motion, his grace said, that he had given order to the Abbot of Dunfermline to deliver me, at my return to Edinburgh, such answer as his grace and the council had caused to be framed to the Castilian's demands, the which, he hoped, I should find to be reasonable; and in case there were anything to their misliking, his grace and the council were contented to be ruled therein by the advice of her majesty, wherein they nothing doubted the care her majesty had, both of the preservation of their young king and his estate. And by occasion of this speech his grace said moreover to me, how he had sent his resolute mind unto my Lord of Morton by the said abbot *touching the great matter*; wherein I found him now very earnest, insomuch that he desired me to write speedily unto both your honours to further the same by all the good means you might, as the best, and as it were, the only salve for the cure of the great sores of this commonwealth. I am also put in good hope of the said abbot that I shall receive a good answer of my Lord of Morton's touching the circumstances, et cetera, which I omit to write till the despatch of my courier, by whom I shall be able to satisfy your honours more at length, having only written thus much, as it were, by the way.

"I perceive the regent's first coldness grew rather for want of skill how to compass so great a matter, than for lack of good will to execute the same. He desired me also to write unto your honours to be suitors unto her majesty for some relief of money towards the payment of his soldiers, without the which he shall not be able to do his master that service he desireth."

The rest of the letter is unimportant.[1]

[1] State-paper Office

Killigrew to Lords Burghley and Leicester.[2]

"*November* 23, 1572.

"My bounden duty most humbly remembered.

"Your honours' letters by Captain Arrington, who brought her majesty's pacquet, I received the 22d of this present, in the which your honours do earnestly charge me with two great, yea, very great faults—one that I should have passed my commission in the handling of the great cause, the other, for that I shewed myself willing to receive so absurd and unreasonable requests as I sent your honours.

"To the first I answer, with all humbleness, under the correction of your good lordships, that whatsoever cause my confounded manner of writing gave your honours so to think, yet if it shall be proved ever hereafter that I used her majesty's name therein, or passed the bounds of my commission, I will never desire more favour of your honours, but rather that ye would do justice upon me to the example of others.

"I forget not, my lords, the great charge her majesty gave me at my coming hither, saying, that no more was privy to this matter but your honours and I, and that if it came forth, the blame should fall thereafter. I could but promise her majesty it should be to me as my life, which I trust I have kept, insomuch that when I was advertised that my Lord Keeper, after his coming to the court, was also made acquainted with the matter, I durst never direct my letters to him, with your lordships, but thought best to leave the same to your wisdoms. And this is absolute to the first point, whatsoever my Cornish English hath occasioned your honours to gather to the contrary, that I never used her majesty's name, or that I would make any motion for them here, but to your honours alone.

"Now, touching the receiving of the Articles, and transcription of them, I did it not without protestation to the Abbot of Dunfermline, how I utterly misliked them, assuring him farther, that I took them not to any other end, but to know of my Lord of Morton, whether they were according to his meaning. Whereupon I remember the abbot replied, alleging certain causes why he thought her majesty would

[2] Original, State-paper Office.

never agree to any such thing, therefore that this was a mean to feel your lordships' judgments, which saying of his I did insert as near as I could remember them in the letter and after the 'Articles.'

"I humbly beseech your honours to consider that this was done at such time as the late regent lay a-dying, which matter and the sequel thereof did so occupy my head and hand, that I was fain to send those Articles with a confused letter, as it were rather to let your honours see the manner of their dealing, (whereof I had given warning before in my other letters,) than that I did allow or like of them; and therefore I advertise your honours how I had told my Lord of Morton plainly, that I had not sent them, but only received them of the abbot, (who was gone over the water,) to know whether they were as his Lordship meant them—who, taking the copy which I had in my hand to shew him, after he had read them, said, that the abbot had missed in something, and desired me not to send the Articles. I answered, he need not desire me, for though he would give me never so much, I would not do it, and in the end made him see that it was rather a mockery than otherwise.

"This your honours may trust to is true, although the time were such then as I could not write all circumstances; and since that time, although I heard some time a glance of the matter, I would never give great ear to it. . . . And truly, my Lords, I was stricken with such sorrow upon the reading of your letters, I was not able since to brook anything I took for sustenance.

. . .

"By your honours' bounden,

"H. KYLLYGREW."[1]

No. XXV., page 352.

Death of Mar.

On the day the Regent Mar died at Stirling,—namely, October 28, 1572,—Killigrew the ambassador wrote this letter to the Lords Burghley and Leicester:—

"May it please your good Lordship, I wrote yesterday to Mr Secretary of the great danger my Lord Regent was in of his life, but since, he having been let blood, is somewhat amended. My Lord of Morton told me the same day that he had received a letter from Alexander Areskine, the regent's brother, that there was no hope of life in him, and willed him to provide accordingly; which he did, as your honours shall understand by Captain Arrington, who shall depart hence to-morrow at the farthest, both with their opinions here for the peace, as also *for the matter ye wot of*, which in mine opinion will nothing satisfy your expectation, unless it may be squared and framed to a better and more reasonable proportion, as I think it will upon your answers. I look this night for a man I sent to Stirling, and therefore shall peradventure stay a little the longer, that I may send you perfect word of the regent's estate. And thus referring all things to Capt. Arrington's letters, I most humbly take my leave of your honours.

"H. KYLLYGREW."[2]

No. XXVI., page 363.

Death of Grange.

REGENT MORTON TO KILLIGREW.

"*Holyrood House, Aug.* 5, 1573.

"After my most hearty commendations, I received your letter from Captain Cockburn as I returned from Stirling towards this town upon the 28th of July, wherein I find a loving continuance of your care and gude will towards the amity of thir[3] countries, and friendship to myself. Of the quhilk[4] I heartily thank you.

"Upon Monday the 3d of August, Grange, his brother Mr James, with Mossman and Cockky, the goldsmiths that made the counterfeit money in the castle, were executed, according to the judgment of the law pronounced against them: and further execution is not yet made. What offers were made on Grange's behalf for safety of his life, I send you herewith the copy, which, as you may consider are large, as meikle[5] as possibly might have been offered. Yet, considering what has been, and daily is, spoken by the preachers, that God's plague will not cease quhill[6] the land be purged of blood, and having regard that such as are interested by the death of their friends, the destruction of their houses, and away taking of their goods, could not be satisfied by any offer made to me in particular, quhilk I accepting, should have been cassin[7] in double in-

[1] State-paper Office.

[2] State-paper Office, Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, 28th October 1572.

[3] These. [4] The which. [5] As much. [6] Until. [7] Thrown.

convenience, I deliberated to let justice proceed as it has done. . . .

"I have written to my Lady Lennox, to crave of the Marshal of Berwick, the king my sovereign's jewels that are in his hands, which he is obliged in honour, and by indenture and promise made at the incoming of the queen's majesty's forces, to deliver in my hands to the king's use. It may be that he will use them liberally now at court, and make friends by them. Therefore, I pray you give advice to my Lady Lennox in what order it is best that she handle this matter."[1]

[1] State-paper Office.

END OF VOL. III.

BALLANTYNE AND COMPANY, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH